

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JAMES SCHLESINGER ON U.S.
POLICY IN THE GULF

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, with the deadline for an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait 1 day away, I continue to strive for a peaceful and just solution to the crisis. I do not believe that the use of U.S. military force at this time is our best course.

I submit for the RECORD the edited congressional testimony of James R. Schlesinger, former Secretary of Defense and former Secretary of Energy. Secretary Schlesinger shares my views that there is a high probability that economic sanctions, if given enough time, will be successful in removing Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

STATEMENT BY JAMES R. SCHLESINGER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE, NOVEMBER 27, 1990

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I deeply appreciate the invitation to discuss with this Committee the challenge posed to American policy and, potentially, to America's armed forces by the developments in the Gulf. When last I addressed this Committee at the beginning of the year, I examined the implications for American policy, attitudes, deployments, and budgetary allocations implied by the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the decline of the Soviet threat. In a sense today represents the continuation of that earlier testimony, for what we are to examine beyond the details of the Gulf crisis itself, is how this nation should grapple with the altered conditions in this post-Cold War environment.

Mr. Chairman, if you will permit, shall deal initially with the shape of the post-Cold War world in which the sharp ideological divisions and the coalitions and alliance polarized to reflect those differences have now been muted. Some, stimulated by the response to the crisis in the Gulf, have expressed the hope that we are now engaged in fashioning a new international order—in which violators of international norms will be regularly constrained or disciplined through the instrument of collective security. Put very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I believe that such aspirations for a Wilsonian utopia are doomed to disappointment. What is emerging is likely to resemble the somewhat disordered conditions before 1938—an era of old-fashioned power politics—marked by national and ethnic rivalries and hatreds, religious tensions, as well as smash and grab, and the pursuit of loot. Such elements clearly mark that catalyzing event, Iraq's seizure of Kuwait, and has marked the behavior of a number of players since August 2nd. To suggest that the international order will miraculously be transformed and that the players on the world scene will be motivated by a dedication to justice and international law strikes me as rather naive.

Mr. Chairman, you and Senator Warner have posed the question: what are America's

interests in the Gulf. I shall mention three—and leave it to the Committee to decide whether they are in ascending or descending order of importance.

First, is oil. There is no way to evading this simple reality. Oil provides the energy source that drives the economies of the industrial and underdeveloped worlds. Were the principal exports of the region palm dates, or pearls, or even industrial products, our response to Iraq's transgression would have been far slower and far less massive than has been the case. Nonetheless, this should not be misunderstood. Our concern is not primarily economic—the price of gasoline at the pump. Were we primarily concerned about the price of oil, we would not have sought to impose an embargo that drove it above \$40 a barrel. Instead, our concern is strategic: we cannot allow so large a portion of the world's energy resources to fall under the domination of a single hostile party. Any such party, even Saddam Hussein, would ordinarily be concerned with the stability of the oil market, the better to achieve the long run exploitation of his economic assets. However, concern focuses on the extraordinary periods—during which he might use his domination of these oil resources to exploit the outside world's vulnerabilities for strategic mischief.

Second, the United States has had an intimate relationship with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It reflects a number of shared strategic objectives—as well as Saudi efforts to stabilize the oil market, most dramatically in the period after the fall of the Shah. It is embodied in the Carter Doctrine which pledges military resistance to external assaults on the Kingdom, as well as the Reagan corollary which subsequently pledged resistance to internal subversion. Failure of the United States to honor such commitments would raise question about the seriousness of the United States, not only in the Middle East but elsewhere. It is notable that down through August 2nd Kuwait itself rebuffed attempts of the United States to provide similar protection—through President Bush's remarks since that date have tended to establish a U.S. commitment to the security of Kuwait.

Third, since the close of World War II and, particularly, since the establishment of the State of Israel, the United States has had a generalized commitment to the stability of the Middle East and to the security of Israel. On numerous occasions this generalized commitment has led to U.S. diplomatic or military involvement in the region—not always marked by complete success.

Let me turn now to the alternative strategies available to the United States and its allies. The first, of course, is to allow the weight of the economic sanctions, imposed in August, gradually to wear down the capacity and the will of Iraq to sustain its present position. The embargo, backed up by a naval blockade, is the most successful ever achieved aside from time of war. Early-on it was officially estimated that it would require a year for the embargo to work. It now appears to be working more rapidly than anticipated. In three months time civilian production is estimated to have declined by

some 40%. Oil exports are nil—and export earnings have dropped correspondingly. The hoard of hard currency, necessary to sustain smuggling, is dwindling away. The economic pressure can only grow worse.

While Iraq's military posture does not appear to have been seriously affected as yet, as the months go by that too will be seriously weakened. Lack of spare parts will force Iraq to begin to cannibalize its military equipment. Military industry, as yet significantly unaffected, will follow the downward path of civilian industry. In short, the burden on both Iraq's economy and her military strength will steadily increase.

We know that such burdens must ultimately affect political judgment and political will. In time, the original objectives of the United Nations will be attained. Already, Saddam Hussein shows a willingness, if not an eagerness, to compromise. One no longer hears that Kuwait is for all eternity the nineteenth province of Iraq. But for some ultimately may not be soon enough, and for others the original objectives may not be sufficient.

To the extent that those original objectives are augmented by demands that Saddam Hussein stand trial as a war criminal, that Iraq provide compensation for the damage it has done, that Iraq's military capacity must be dismantled or destroyed, or that Saddam Hussein must be removed from power, Saddam's determination to hang on will be strengthened. Some may prefer such a response in that it precludes a "settlement and makes recourse to military force more likely. Nonetheless, if one avoids this list of additional demands and is satisfied with the original objectives, the probability that the economic sanctions will result in a satisfactory outcome is very high. One should note that, since the original estimate was that the sanctions route would require a year, it seems rather illogical to express impatience with them, because they will not have produced the hoped-for results in six months time.

In this connection one should also note the frequently expressed view that Saddam Hussein must not be "rewarded" for his aggression, but instead must be "punished". As an expression of emotion it is understandable, but it must not be allowed to obscure our sense of reality. Saddam Hussein is being punished and punished severely. He has forfeited \$20 billion of foreign exchange earnings a year—indeed \$30 billion at the current oil price. Iraq's credit is totally destroyed, and the remnants of its hard currency reserves dwindling. When Saddam looks across the border at Saudi Arabia or the UAE, they are prospering because of his actions—from which he himself has derived no benefit. He is likely to be consumed by envy. His own economy is rapidly becoming a basket case.

Moreover, the position of preponderance that he had earlier achieved in OPEC is now gone. He is diplomatically isolated. His military position will slowly be degraded. His pawns in Lebanon have been wiped out—by his chief Baathist rival, Assad, who has immensely strengthened his own position. He has been forced to accept an embarrassing peace with Iran, and that nation's position

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Ⓜ Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

relative to Iraq is slowly being improved. Sympathetic nations like Jordan and Yemen have been harshly treated—and neither they nor he have any recourse. On the benefit side stands only the looting of Kuwait.

In brief, Saddam Hussein staked Iraq's position on a roll of the dice—and lost. Only if he has a deeply masochistic streak can he regard himself as "rewarded". To allow our political rhetoric to obscure the severe punishment that has already been meted out or to suggest that our current policy is in some way unsuccessful and that Saddam's position is now or is potentially enviable strikes me as misconceived.

That brings us to the second alternative—the military option.

There is little question that the United States and its allies can inflict a crippling military defeat on Iraq. It can eject Iraq from Kuwait; it can destroy Iraq's military forces and military industries; it can destroy, if it wishes, Iraq's cities. The question is at what cost—and whether it is wise to incur that cost. Whenever a nation accepts the hazards of war, the precise outcome is not predetermined. Depending upon the military strategy chosen and the tenacity of Iraq's forces, there could be a considerable variation in the outcome. In the event of an all-out assault on entrenched Iraqi positions, the casualties may be expected to run into several tens of thousands. However, if we avoid that all-out assault, make use of our decisive advantages in the air, and exploit the opponent's vulnerabilities by our own mobility, the casualties could be held to a fraction of the prior estimate. In between four and eight weeks, it should all be over—save for starving out or mopping up the remaining Iraqi forces in Kuwait. The question then becomes whether one goes on to occupy Iraq, to destroy the balance of Iraqi forces, and the like. That would be far more difficult and time consuming, but circumstances may make it unavoidable.

I think it prudent to say no more about strategy and tactics in this session. Suffice it to say that the immediate price will not be small. American forces would be obliged to carry a disproportionate burden in any struggle. This will affect the attitudes of our public and the attitudes in the Middle East regarding the United States.

I believe that the direct cost of combat—including that of a probable scorched earth policy in Kuwait—will be the lesser part of the total cost. The Middle East would never be the same. It is a fragile, inflammable, and unpredictable region. The sight of the United States inflicting a devastating defeat on an Arab country from the soil of an Arab neighbor may result in an enmity directed at the United States for an extended period, not only by Iraq and its present supporters, but ultimately among the publics of some of the nations now allied to us. To be sure, there are no certainties, yet that risk must be born in mind. Moreover, the United States will be obliged to involve itself deeply in the reconstruction of the region in the aftermath of a shattering war. In brief, the non-combat costs of a recourse to war, while not calculable in advance, are likely to be substantial.

On November 8 President Bush announced his decision to acquire "an offensive military option" and nearly to double U.S. forces deployed in the Persian Gulf. That announcement altered the strategic, diplomatic, and psychological landscape. The deployment of our additional armored divisions implied that the United States might itself choose to cross that "line in the sand"

and forcibly eject Iraq's troops from Kuwait. As the President indicated that earlier deployment in August had been intended "to deter further Iraqi aggression".

One must recognize that to this point Saddam Hussein has remained unmoved by either appeals or international declarations. It is only the prospect that force might be used against him that has brought forth any sign of a willingness to compromise. The principal goal of the Administration in deciding on these deployments may simply be to increase the pressure on Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait.

It should also be noted that Mr. Primakov's observations were confined to the original objective of forcing an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and the restoration of the legitimate regime. Of late, to those original objectives, some additional goals have been hinted or stated: the elimination of Iraq's capacity to intimidate her neighbors, the removal of Iraq's military capability, the removal of Saddam Hussein from power, and the ending of Iraq's quest for a nuclear capability. The general effect is to paint Iraq as a rogue or outlaw state—and that its menace to its neighbors and to the international order must be eliminated. To the extent that these additional objectives are embraced, either in appearance or reality, the prospect for a voluntary Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait is sharply diminished. To achieve these objectives, there is really no alternative but to resort to war. Saddam Hussein's inclination to dig in will be stiffened—and in all likelihood the willingness of Iraqi forces to resist will be strengthened.

Consideration of the military option will be influenced by attitudes within the international coalition that the United States has organized. By and large that coalition has revealed strong ambivalence regarding the military option and a preference for a diplomatic solution—with those least directly involved most dubious about the military option. While the members of that coalition may be prepared to accept military force to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, to this point they have shown little inclination to embrace the sterner objectives of policy that have been stated but never officially presented or embraced.

There is, of course, a third strategic alternative: the possibility of a diplomatic solution. Though it remains an eventual possibility, I shall spend little time on it in this hearing for two reasons. First, the United States is probably precluded from any negotiations with Iraq by the position that it initially announced: we will not have any direct communication with Iraq until it has left Kuwait. For the United States itself to enter into negotiations would represent too much of a diplomatic retreat. To be sure, others have been willing to serve the role of diplomatic intermediaries. Since August the possibility of an "Arab solution" has been raised on several occasions. The Soviets, the French, and others have conducted explorations. But, as the probability of recourse to war rises, the probability of a diplomatic settlement, of necessity shrinks. That brings me to my second reason for limiting discussion of this alternative: if there is to be a diplomatic solution, it will be several months before the outlines jell. The United States, given its position, will be obliged to appear merely to acquiesce in such an outcome—out of deference to pressures from other elements of international community.

There is something more, however, to be said about the diplomatic situation. In your

letter of inquiry, Mr. Chairman, you and Senator Warner inquired about the durability of allied support for the multinational coalition. In regard to the original demands on Iraq and the use of sanctions, that support has been firmer than we might have anticipated. Saddam's appeal to the "hearts and minds" in the Arab countries seems to have peaked in September. There has been little restlessness elsewhere in the coalition—no doubt, in large degree, due to the fact that the world can do without Iraqi and Kuwaiti crude. Moreover, the status quo includes authorization for the naval blockade, which can therefore be continued indefinitely. It would take a positive act of the United Nations to remove that authorization.

However, that coalition is likely to prove less durable, if combat takes place. Particularly would this be the case if the objectives turn out to be the new and sterner demands of war policy, reflecting the decision that Iraq has become an outlaw state that must be dealt with now. Needless to say, the international coalition has yet to embrace that line of reasoning.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I close with observations regarding two inherent difficulties in the emerging situation.

First, if the United States conveys the impression that it has moved beyond the original international objectives to the sterner objectives that Saddam Hussein must go, that Iraq's military establishment and the threat to the region must be dismantled or eliminated, etc., then whatever incentive Saddam Hussein may presently have to acquiesce in the international community's present demands and to leave Kuwait will shrink toward zero. This may please those who have decided that the war option is the preferable one, but it makes it increasingly hard to hold together the international coalition, which we initially put together to bless our actions in the Gulf. That brings us to the second observation: the more we rely on the image of Iraq as an outlaw state to justify taking military action, the more we make holding together the international coalition inherently difficult, if not impossible. International approval of our actions is something on which the Administration has set great store. It has provided the desire legitimacy. To abandon it would mean the undermining of any claim to establishing a new international order.

Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me one final word that goes beyond the crisis in the Gulf. That crisis has preoccupied our attention for more than three months and is likely to do so for many months more. It has diverted our attention from subjects that may be of equal or even greater importance. Six months ago all of us were deeply moved by the developments in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union—and with the prospect that those nations might move toward democracy and economic reform. Members of this Committee will recall our high hopes at that time. Yet, in the intervening period, with the diverting of our attention to the Gulf, those prospects have been dealt a grievous blow. First was the Soviet decision to force the former satellites to pay hard currency for their oil. Second, it was followed by the Gulf crisis that has sharply raised the international price of oil. The prospects and hopes for Eastern Europe, while our attention has been diverted, have been seriously damaged. Yet, to return to my original theme, in the shaping of the post-Cold War world it is not clear that the evolution of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union may

not be more important than developments in the Gulf.

EMERGING TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the text of the Emerging Telecommunications Technologies Act of 1991 together with the chairman of the Telecommunications Subcommittee, Mr. MARKEY. This important bill was passed by the House in the last Congress. The Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing on a companion measure late in the last session, but was unable to pass its measure prior to adjournment. It is my hope that both Chambers will act on this legislation expeditiously, so that it can be signed into law before the end of the year.

There are several differences between the bill we are introducing today and that which passed the House last July. Some are technical in nature, representing clarifications of provisions that were ambiguous. Additional changes are the result of conversations with public safety communications officials, clarifying their status and making sure that their needs will be addressed. Other changes are the result of discussions with the Senate, and take into account some of the objections to last year's bill that surfaced in the other body. Finally, we have continued to work with the administration, taking their concerns into account, in the hope that they will act more positively than was the case last year.

The thrust of the legislation remains the same. The Federal Government continues to have a claim on approximately 40 percent of the usable electromagnetic spectrum. Spectrum is a critical resource, essential for technological development. It is a finite resource, and its effective and efficient use requires careful management.

The record compiled last year by the Telecommunications Subcommittee leaves no doubt that the Government's share is too large, and is being managed inefficiently. Every single former Administrator of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration agrees with that assessment. Every former Administrator—Democrat and Republican alike—endorses this bill. Every one of them agrees that giving the Federal Communications Commission additional frequencies to allocate is essential for the development of new spectrum-dependent telecommunications products and services.

The legislation requires the Secretary of Commerce to identify 200 MHz of Government spectrum that can, over time, be turned over to the FCC. It establishes an advisory committee to assist the Secretary in this effort, and to propose changes in the way spectrum is allocated between the FCC and Commerce Department. Finally, the bill requires the FCC to plan for the disposition of the spectrum, taking into consideration not only the existing congestion that currently limits spectrum use, but also the spectrum needs of new technologies.

There are a host of potential new applications. High definition television is one such use. There is also the so-called personal communications networks—literally wristwatch radios that can connect individuals to the entire world, no matter where they might be. Satellite systems, radio systems, and other spectrum-dependent devices can only be developed if spectrum is made available.

Other nations recognize the linkage between spectrum decisions and leadership in developing new technologies. Great Britain, the European Community, and Japan each have aggressive Government-sponsored efforts to take leadership from American companies. Our innovators need our help. Unless this bill passes, each new use for spectrum will have to depend on someone else giving up—or being forced to give up—frequencies for the new use. This is a difficult and time-consuming task, and will delay the introduction of new technologies for decades.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will bring this bill back to the full House expeditiously, and that the Senate will move equally quickly. Passage of this legislation is critical for America's leadership in spectrum-dependent technologies, and represents one of my highest priorities for the 102d Congress.

ENERGY POLICY AND THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, we have been presented with a number of rationalizations for the use of military force to remove the Iraqi occupation force from the oil kingdom of Kuwait. One of the most frequently heard justifications is that we must defend the integrity of the Middle Eastern oil-producing states in order to preserve our access to cheap, plentiful oil.

In November, Secretary of State James Baker said that:

The economic lifeline of the industrial world runs from the gulf and we cannot permit a dictator such as this to sit astride that economic lifeline. To bring it down to the level of the average American citizen, let me say that means jobs.

Of course, Secretary Baker was only reaffirming policy laid out earlier by President Bush, who declared on August 15 that:

We are talking about maintaining access to energy resources that are key, not just to the functioning of this country but to the entire world. Our jobs, our way of life, our own freedom, and the freedom of friendly countries around the world would all suffer if control of the world's great oil reserves fell into the hands of that one man, Saddam Hussein.

I rise to dispute that contention, Mr. Speaker. If we choose to endorse the ill-conceived policy of armed intervention in the gulf, then let us not mislead ourselves into thinking that we do so in order to maintain energy supplies that are either cheap or beneficial to our economy.

We are experiencing our third major disruption of oil production from the Middle East since the embargo of 1973. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait caused prices to skyrocket some 170 percent in 3 months, exacerbating recessionary trends in our national economy, and causing real tragedy and suffering among the nations of the Third World. In fact, to underscore the instability in these markets, I note that recently, prices fluctuated some 30 percent in the brief period of 5 minutes, with the cost of oil increasing from \$24 to \$31 per barrel. Yet, Iraq's invasion did not cause more than momentary disruption of world oil production, only the perception that disruption may one day occur. As a result, oil producers and multinational energy companies have reaped a windfall of unexpected revenue, and both the concentration of wealth and the concentration of available reserves have increased.

The ripple effects of dependency on our cheap and plentiful oil suppliers in the Middle East has left the Dow Jones average at its lowest point since November, with some pointing out ominous similarities to the 1987 crisis in financial markets.

If we truly wish to protect our national interests, the fundamental problem we must address is our failure to enact those measures necessary to move toward an energy sector more reliant on alternatives to petroleum fuels. Reforms are urgently needed to motivate a transition to a policy climate that encourages the utilization of available and proven alternatives, such as solar, geothermal, wind, biomass, and improved energy efficiency. With a diversified and self-sustaining energy sector, we would be largely immune to the upheavals and geopolitical intrigues that plague the Middle East and can reasonably be expected to continue for the foreseeable future.

We must also realize the hidden costs of our cheap and plentiful oil supply. According to Worldwatch Institute estimates, energy industries in the United States received subsidies worth some \$44 billion annually in 1984, the most recent year for which data is available. These subsidies have certainly increased in value since then, especially if you add in the \$2.5 billion in tax giveaways that President Bush insisted on as part of last year's budget summit agreement—\$46.5 billion in subsidies is almost \$200 for every man, woman, and child in America added on to our burgeoning Federal deficit. Can we honestly call that cheap energy? And yet, Mr. Speaker, these figures do not even begin to account for the cost of our deployment of forces to the Middle East, which could easily equal the aforementioned cost of subsidies to the energy industry. And even before the commencement of Operation Desert Shield, our preparations for war in this region would add more than \$60 to each barrel of imported oil, again according to the Worldwatch Institute, citing studies performed by the Economic Strategy Institute.

We must embark upon a coherent, comprehensive energy policy initiative that is both economically and environmentally sound. Let that be the offensive action urged upon the Nation by this body, Mr. Speaker, not a bloody and sustained conflict that will result in suffering on a scale not seen since the Vietnam war.

WHEN POLITICS OVERWHELMS
SCIENCE: THE STORY OF ACID
RAIN AND THE NAPAP STUDY

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I have attached the transcript of an extraordinary segment broadcast on the CBS newshow "60 Minutes" on December 30, 1990, describing one of the greatest political success stories of the 1980s: the environmental party's ability to stifle all debate on the findings of the National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program [NAPAP] and enact into law an unnecessary and unduly expensive acid rain abatement program in the recently passed Clean Air Act.

As the only member of the House-Senate Clean Air Conference Committee to oppose this legislation, I brought the NAPAP findings to my colleagues' attention at every opportunity, but to no avail. Although quite a few of my fellow conferees acknowledged off the record that the NAPAP findings argued eloquently on behalf of a scaled-back version of the acid rain component of the Clean Air Act, none were willing to join me in my calls for such an approach.

What explains such a blatant disregard for sound science? Unfortunately, as the segment made clear, the environmental party in America is to blame. This party is so powerful that it succeeded in convincing the vast majority of our elected representatives to ignore the findings of these esteemed scientists and to pursue environmental demons that do not exist. Simply put, the environmental party has a ring through the nose of the Congress of the United States, which compliantly passes multi-billion dollar environmental regulatory programs that destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs and offer the American people little or no environmental protection.

The comments of the top lobbyist for the National Resources Defense Council sum up the attitude of these environmental activists: "(I)f the public believes that environmental protection is important and they are prepared to spend more of our wealth in protecting the environment, then its responsive to do that." But, how can the American public decide that constitutes a legitimate environmental threat when supposedly credible organizations such as the NRDC ignore the best available scientific information and, through manipulative disinformation campaigns, convince well-meaning citizens of the need for costly and unnecessary solutions?

The answer lies in a responsible media that will place the NAPAP findings on page one before the Congress considers the issue and offer the American public enough information to make an informed and wise choice on environmental issues such as acid rain. A high level NAPAP official once told one of my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee that in all the years of NAPAP's existence not once did the Washington Post file a report on its progress or conclusions. That sort of de facto censorship must end.

The environmental party, with its preference for additional layers of governmental regula-

tion and massive and lengthy lawsuits, fears an outbreak of domestic glasnost. Such an openness, I believe, would strip away the credibility and the perceived political clout of the environmental party and allow Americans and their elected representatives to achieve a much-needed balance between the protection of our environment and the continued vitality and growth of the U.S. economy.

I urge my colleagues to review the "60 Minutes" transcript and consider its implications for future environmental policymaking.

[From 60 Minutes Transcript, Dec. 30, 1990]

ACID RAIN

KROFT: Acid rain and ecological catastrophe: two phrases that in many people's minds have become almost synonymous. Acid rain—poisons falling out of the sky, killing our forests and ravaging the countryside, and all of it coming from sulfur-polluting smokestacks of the Midwest. But the most expensive and exhaustive scientific study ever conducted on an environmental problem, which took 10 years, hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of scientists to conduct, is about to publish its final report, which takes the conventional wisdom about acid rain and shoots it full of holes.

JAMES MAHONEY, Acid Rain Expert: I think we can be very simple about it. Acid rain is definitely a problem that needs improvement. It is not an ecological catastrophe at the levels we see here in the United States.

KROFT: [voice-over] Dr. James Mahoney is director of the National Acid Protection Assessment Program—NAPAP for short. What he and his scientists found out while conducting the government study is really quite different from what most people have come to believe about acid rain.

Mr. MAHONEY: I think our science clearly shows that the effects are less severe by quite a bit than the most extreme stories we sometimes hear.

KROFT: [voice-over] And what are some of those stories: Well, here's an example. Earlier this year, *Newsday* reported that wispy clouds creeping silently through the Northeast's forests are slowly killing off trees.

Mr. MAHONEY: I think that's in the sense of poetic characterization.

KROFT: Overblown?

Mr. MAHONEY: In a word.

KROFT: [voice-over] In fact, the NAPAP study says acid rain isn't killing trees—period. We quote: "There is no evidence of a general or unusual decline of forests in the United States and Canada due to acid rain." The study did find that acid rain may be harmful to one kind of tree, the red spruce, at very high elevations, but that natural stresses like frost and insects are more significant factors in the loss of those trees.

Mr. MAHONEY: There is a broad view that acid rain kills trees on a broad basis. The scientific community, I believe even the environmentally active scientific community, now understands that this is not what we see.

KROFT: You certainly wouldn't get that impression reading news stories about acid rain.

Mr. MAHONEY: Our job is to carry out these scientific studies and to do the best job we can of being scientific fact-finders. News stories are much more likely to take an extreme position. It's much easier to write a story about a problem and to characterize it as being caused by acid rain.

KROFT: [voice-over] And what about the effect of acid rain on lakes? Well, for the past 10 years it's been widely reported that lakes in the Northeast are dying by the thousands and a report by the National Academy of Sciences in 1981 predicted that the number of acid-dead lakes would nearly double by the year 1990.

[interviewing] Has that happened?

Mr. MAHONEY: No definitely not.

KROFT: What's the increase been?

Mr. MAHONEY: Our best estimate is that the level of—the number of acid lakes is probably just about the same now as it was a decade ago, and that's a fundamental difference compared to the commentary that the National Academy of Sciences made 10 years ago.

KROFT: [voice-over] The study found that acid rain does contribute to the acidity of lakes and streams, and it did find a large number of lakes to be acidic particularly in New York's Adirondack Mountains, more than 200 out of several thousands. But most of those affected lakes are small in size, representing about 2 percent of the surface water in the Adirondacks, and many of those lakes were acidic before the industrial revolution, before there was acid rain. Acid rain, the study says, is one of many factors which causes acidity in lakes. The other reasons; acidic soil and wild vegetation.

Mr. MAHONEY: Interestingly, the percentage of acidic lakes and streams is highest in the nation in Florida, by quite a bit. We know that the causation in many of these is natural. It has nothing to do with acid rain.

KROFT: [voice-over] The study did confirm some concerns about acid rain. The sulfur emissions that cause it affect visibility. Acid rain itself does damage buildings and statues. But the problem is getting better, not worse. Sulfur emissions are down more than 25 percent since the Clean Air Act of 1970 went into effect, and those emissions will continue to drop as more and more old coal-burning factories are phased out and replaced.

Soil scientist Eg Krug [sp?] was one of many NAPAP scientists who looked into the effects acid rain on lakes and he says it's not a crisis.

EG KRUG, Acid Rain Expert: We believe that the effects of acid rain are there, but they're subtle. They're difficult to find. We can see other environmental insults very easily but acid rain—it speaks that it's not a particularly large problem.

KROFT: The New York Times reported recently that over the last 10 years, while NAPAP has been doing its study, the number of lakes turned into aquatic death-traps multiplied across New York, New England and the South, stretches of forest along the Appalachian spine from Georgia to Maine, once lush and teeming with wildlife, were fast becoming ragged landscapes of dead and dying trees. True?

Mr. KRUG: No. No. I don't know where they got that from. It appears to be another assertion, unsubstantiated, because we've spent hundreds of millions of dollars surveying the environment to see if that was occurring and we do not see the occurring.

KROFT: [voice-over] To be exact, they spent \$570 million of government money and they are more than 3,000 scientists from places like Yale, Pennsylvania, Dartmouth and the National Laboratories at Oak Ridge and Argon [sp?].

Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN (D-NY): Good science—world-class science.

KROFT: [voice-over] Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote the bill which started

this 10-year study because he was concerned about the lakes and the streams in his home state of New York.

Senator MOYNIHAN: We didn't know but what we were going to lose all our lakes and half our forests and God knows what else. It's good news to find that you don't have a devastating problem. It's also good news to know what kind of problem you have.

KROFT: [voice-over] It's not, however, been received as good news by most environmental groups. David Hawkins [sp?], a lobbyist for the National Resources Defense Council, says there's not much new in the NAPAP study. Hawkins says it confirms that acid rain is a problem and that the scientific community knew that 10 years ago.

DAVID HAWKINS: Environmental Lobbyist: The environmental community has spent almost no effort attempting to even monitor the progress of this program because we felt that this program was essentially a misdirection of resources and that our resources were better spent in trying to deal with the facts that we already have in hand about the damages due to acid rain. We have been working on trying to get legislation in Washington to clean up the problem, actually attack the pollution problem.

KROFT: So you've been working the political angle of it?

Mr. HAWKINS: I've been working the legislative angle of it, yes, trying to get a new law to control the pollution.

KROFT: Wait a minute. You seem to be saying it doesn't matter what the scientists say. What matters is passing the legislation.

Mr. HAWKINS: No, what we're saying is that you don't need additional years of documenting facts that we already have enough information about to know that the risks are so great that we should control pollution now rather than wait for additional years of research.

KROFT: [voice-over] Hawkins says that even if acid rain isn't a crisis, he considers it serious enough to require action and the legislation he's talking about is the tough acid rain provision of the new Clean Air Act, which his group, other top environmental lobbyists, the President and the Congress pushed through at the end of this last session. It will cost U.S. industries \$4 billion to \$7 billion a year to cut emissions that cause acid rain in half.

[on camera] What about the NAPAP study? It wasn't even a factor. The study received a one-hour hearing before a Senate subcommittee and was never even formally presented to the House of Representatives.

Senator JOHN GLENN (D-OH): We spend over \$500 million on the most definitive study of acid precipitation that's ever been done in the history of the world anyway, and then we don't want to listen to what they say.

KROFT: [voice-over] Senator John Glenn is concerned that the new legislation to cut down smokestack emissions will have a devastating effect on this home state of Ohio, not to mention Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky and parts of Indiana where high-sulfur coal, long blamed for causing acid rain, is not only the main source of energy but a major source of employment. Factories will be forced to install expensive new pollution control equipment. Utility rates are expected to jump by as much as 30 percent and 100,000 people could end up losing their jobs, many of them coal miners.

ROBERT MURRAY [sp?]. Owner, Ohio Valley Coal Company: We're out of business. We're out of business. Our jobs are gone.

KROFT: [voice-over] Robert Murray owns the Ohio Valley Coal Company. He says more

than 400 jobs are at stake at his company alone and he can't understand why no one is listening to the scientists.

Mr. MURRAY: The networks, the electronic media, the written media, have placed acid rain up to the point that our teachers, our students are totally confused about the issue, yet when the NAPAP study came out, you found it on page 34 of *The New York Times*. You didn't find it on CNN, CBS, ABC or NBC at all!

KROFT: You're very upset about this.

Mr. MURRAY: I am damned mad because this political issue is a human issue to me!

KROFT: [voice-over] About the only person who has written about the NAPAP study is this man, syndicated columnist Warren Brooks [sp?], who's made it a crusade.

WARREN BROOKS, Syndicated Columnist: It's sort of like trying to kill a gnat with a blunderbuss. I mean, it's just—we have this tendency to overdo it in this country. We just throw money at problems and I think we all agree that we don't have that kind of money to throw any more.

KROFT: [voice-over] Brooks has read the reports, studied the science and his conclusions have become the gospel for a growing number of people convinced that America is suffering from environmental hypochondria and that this acid rain legislation is just the most recent example.

Mr. BROOKS: If it's a crisis, we should act. We should—you know, damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead. What this study shows clearly is it's not a crisis. We should not damn the torpedoes. We should do it sensibly so we don't throw people out of work unnecessarily.

KROFT: Why has nobody listened to it?

Mr. BROOKS: Well, the point is that once their minds are made up—that is, "We're going to do something on acid rain. We're going to do something"—the politics is, "We're going to do something—"

KROFT: That's happened. That's what's going on here.

Mr. BROOKS: That's what's going on.

KROFT: [voice-over] Brooks says the political agenda was set by candidate George Bush when he pledged to become the "environmental president" and to do something about acid rain. Brooks claims that Congress, looking at public opinion polls, decided voting against clean air was like voting against motherhood.

[Interviewing] So you're saying this has a lot more to do with politics than it does with science.

Mr. BROOKS: Absolutely. Absolutely.

KROFT: There are votes in it.

Mr. BROOKS: Yeah. Very simple.

Mr. HAWKINS: We live in a representative democracy and if the public believes that environmental protection is important and they are prepared to spend more of our wealth in protecting the environment, then it's responsible to do that.

KROFT: And you think the American public is well-informed on this issue.

Mr. HAWKINS: I think the American public can look out their windows and see what we're doing to the environment. They can read about it in papers. They can read about it in books.

KROFT: [voice-over] So what are we going to get for those billions spent to control acid rain, not to mention the lost jobs? Well, according to Warren Brooks, the only certain benefit will be the recovery of about 75 small lakes out of several thousand in New York's Adirondack Mountains.

Mr. BROOKS: Now, that's at \$5 billion a year for, whatever, 50 years. That comes out to about \$4 billion a lake.

KROFT: [voice-over] The Bush administration and environmental groups say there's much more to it than that, that what we're getting is cleaner air, better visibility, less damage to buildings and an insurance policy in case there are any unknown effects on human health which simply haven't been seen yet.

Mr. HAWKINS: We have very crude scientific tools. Even though we spent lots of money on it, the idea that a team of scientists can take a few years, wander around the forests and come up with "the answer"—well, the Greeks had a word for it. It's *hubris*. It's pride. And they're saying that because we spent a few years backpacking around these forests with a lot of instruments and we can't find anything, we should assume there is nothing.

Mr. KRUG: Actually, we do know a lot. We know that the acid rain problem is so small that it's hard to see, so it's the difference between an optimist and a pessimist, the classic example of whether the glass is full or empty. In this case, there's a couple of drops in the bottom of the glass and people are saying it's full and the rest of us are looking down and saying, "It looks mostly empty."

PAYING FOR THE DESERT SHIELD MILITARY OPERATION

HON. TIMOTHY J. PENNY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, along with our colleagues BARNEY FRANK, JOLENE UNSOELD, TONY BELENSON, CHARLIE FRANGEL, and HENRY NOWAK, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution that expresses the sense of the Congress on paying for the Desert Shield military operation.

While the threat of hostilities and our concern for the young women and men serving in the gulf must continue to be uppermost in our minds, the Congress must also express its constitutional responsibility to determine appropriations for the military.

And with the release of Office of Management and Budget [OMB] and Congressional Budget Office [CBO] reports last month, the Congress and the American people have only recently become aware of the potential liability of Operation Desert Shield. CBO estimates expenditures at just over \$1 billion per month, while OMB pegs the final costs closer to \$15 billion per year. If hostilities were to begin, the Center for Defense Information and economist Henry Kaufmann estimate expenditures to increase to \$450 to \$500 million per day, or approximately \$13.5 to \$15 billion per month. During testimony before the House Budget Committee recently, Comptroller Charles Bowsher estimated the final cost of the desert operation at \$130 billion in fiscal year 1991. Unfortunately, the Department of Defense refuses to release any official projected estimates of the costs associated with Desert Shield, and the administration has also refused to divulge our allies' contributions.

We do know that our allies, notably the Saudis, are reaping a windfall. By recent estimates, increased oil production will result in \$13 to \$60 billion in additional revenue for the kingdom this year. Our other allies, the Euro-

peans and Japan, who are more dependent on Middle East oil than the United States, have made only token contributions for the gulf operation.

With the deficit for the current fiscal year nearing \$300 billion and with all the necessary funds for the gulf operation yet to be appropriated, the Congress must act to avoid a financial hemorrhage during a period of slow-down in the economy. The Congress must also keep faith with the budget agreement agreed to last year.

In keeping with the budget agreement and the new budget process, the resolution states that the costs of the desert operation must be equitably shared by our allies; and that in order to cover the financial costs to the United States of Operation Desert Shield that are not covered by allied contributions: First, reductions should be made in existing or planned military expenditures; and for any remaining cost, a surtax should be imposed on high-income taxpayers.

This course of action by the Congress will ensure that we do not borrow additional funds and increase the deficit to pay for the gulf operation and pass the burden of today's actions to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of the concurrent resolution be placed in the RECORD at this point:

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas the Congress fully supports the actions taken by the President and the members of the United Nations to defend Saudi Arabia, and demands that Iraq immediately withdraw from its illegal occupation of Kuwait; and

Whereas every diplomatic and economic initiative should be pursued to resolve the crisis in the Persian Gulf region brought on by such occupation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the financial costs of Operation Desert Shield should be equitably shared by our allies; and

(2) to cover the financial costs to the United States of Operation Desert Shield that are not covered by allied contributions—

(A) first, reductions should be made in existing or planned military expenditures; and

(B) for any remaining costs, a surtax should be imposed on high-income taxpayers.

BRZEZINSKI SUPPORTS SANCTIONS OVER WAR IN THE GULF

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, with 1 day remaining for Saddam Hussein to remove his troops from Kuwait or face a possible United States attack, I continue to firmly believe that at this time the United States should continue to vigorously enforce economic sanctions and pursue diplomatic negotiations. It should not engage in any offensive military action.

I submit for the RECORD the congressional testimony of Zbigniew Brzezinski, the former National Security Adviser under President Carter. He shares my views that diplomatic

negotiations, coupled with severe economic sanctions, have a great potential to bring a peaceful and just resolution to this crisis; and at this time, war is not the answer.

STATEMENT BY ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, U.S. SENATE, DECEMBER 5, 1990

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin with a brief personal comment. As many of you know, I supported President Bush in the 1988 elections and I have supported his foreign policy all the way along. Moreover, I do not subscribe to the notion that the use of force is altogether precluded in international affairs. I mention this because I would not want my views to be interpreted as motivated either by political or by ideological biases.

Let me also say right off that I have supported and still support the initial decisions of the President regarding both troop deployments to deter any further Iraqi aggression and the imposition of sanctions on Iraq for the flagrant aggression that it did commit. The President and his team are to be commended for the skill with which the international coalition has been put together and for the impressively prompt deployment of American power. The policy of punitive containment of Iraq rightly gained almost universal international and domestic support.

In examining the fateful choices that America now faces, I have divided my testimony into two parts in the first, I argue that war is not necessary because ongoing policy represents an effective response to Saddam Hussein's misconduct; and in the second I outline the issues that the Congress should, in my view, explore more fully, given the apparent Presidential inclination to go to war.

WAR IS NOT NECESSARY

Most Americans, I am sure, share the hope that the President's recent—and laudable—decision to initiate a direct dialogue with the Iraqi government will lead to a serious and comprehensive exploration of a non-violent solution to the ongoing crisis. Wisely, the President indicated that the purpose of such a dialogue is not to merely convey an ultimatum but to convince Iraq that its compliance with the U.N. resolution is the necessary precondition for a peaceful settlement. It is thus not an accident that those who so fervently have been advocating war have promptly denounced the President's initiative.

To be meaningful, such a dialogue has to go beyond demands for unconditional surrender and involve also some discussion of the consequences of Iraqi compliances with the U.N. resolutions. That means that Iraq, in the course of the ensuing discussions, will have to be given some preliminary indications of the likely political, territorial, and financial aftermath of its withdrawal from Kuwait. I stress these points because those who favor only a military solution will now exercise pressure on the President to reduce the incipient dialogue essentially to a mere transmittal of an ultimatum. That, I trust, everyone recognizes would be pointless and counter-productive. It would simply accelerate the drift to war.

While it is premature to detail here the substance of a non-violent solution to the crisis that could emerge from the proposed dialogue, it is possible to envisage a series of sequential but linked phases, all premises on Iraq having satisfied the necessary preconditions regarding Kuwait.

(i) coercive sanctions would be maintained until Iraq implements its willingness to

comply with the U.N. resolutions regarding a withdrawal from Kuwait.

(ii) binding arbitration by a U.N.-sanctioned body within a specified timeframe would be accepted by the Governments of Iraq and Kuwait regarding territorial delimitation, conflicting financial claims, and other pertinent matters;

(iii) an international conference would be convened to establish regional limitations on weapons of mass destruction, pending which a U.N.-sponsored security force would remain deployed in Kuwait and perhaps in Saudi Arabia to ensure needed security.

It is important to note that any dialogue to the above effect would be conducted while Iraq is being subjected to severe sanctions. The U.S. would be therefore conceding nothing while conducting the talks. It is Iraq that is under duress, not us. It is Iraqi power that is being attrited, while ours is growing. It is Iraq that is isolated and threatened with destruction, not us.

Nor would any such outcome as the one outlined above be tantamount to rewarding aggression. Those who argue that do so because they desire only one outcome, no matter what the price to America: the destruction of Iraq. Withdrawal from Kuwait would represent a massive setback for Saddam Hussein and a victory for the international order. It would be a dramatic reversal of aggression, humiliating and painful to the aggressor.

However, it is quite possible, perhaps even probable that the talks will initially prove unproductive. In my view, that should not be viewed as a *Casus belli*. Instead, we should stay on course, applying the policy of punitive containment. The policy is working, Iraq has been deterred, ostracized and punished. Sanctions, unprecedented in their international solidarity and more massive in scope than any ever adopted in peacetime against any nation—I repeat, ever adopted against any nation—are inflicting painful costs on the Iraq economy.

Economic sanctions, by definition, require time to make their impact felt but they have already established the internationally significant lesson that Iraq's aggression did not pay. By some calculations, about 97% of Iraq's income and 90 of its imports have been cut off, and the shutdown of the equivalent of 43% of Iraq's and Kuwait's GNP has already taken place. This is prompting the progressive attrition of the country's economy and war-making capabilities. Extensive rationing is a grim social reality. Over time, all this is bound to have an unsettling effect on Saddam Hussein's power. And sanctions can—and should—be maintained until Iraq complies with the U.N. resolution, at which point (as noted earlier), there will have to be some negotiations regarding the modalities of the implementation of the U.N. resolution as well as the adjudication of the some of the related conflicting issues between Iraq and Kuwait.

The Administration's argument that the sanctions are not working suggests that in the first instance it had entertained extremely naive notions regarding how sanctions actually do work. They not only take time; they are by their nature an instrument for softening up the opponent, inducing in the adversary a more compliant attitude towards and eventual non-violent resolution. Sanctions are not a blunt instrument for promptly achieving total surrender.

Worse still, the Administration's actions and its rhetoric have conveyed a sense of impatience that in fact has tended to undermine the credibility of long-term sanctions.

Instead of projecting confident but patient resolution, the President's message has been one of frustration and of a desire to get it over with. Perhaps the Administration felt that this was necessary to convince Saddam Hussein that it meant business. But the consequence has been to make the Administration the prisoner of its own rhetoric, with American options and timetable thereby severely constricted.

The cumulative result has been to move the United States significantly beyond the initial policy of punitive containment, with the result that the conflict of the international community with Iraq has become over-Americanized, over-personalized, and over-emotionalized. The enormous deployment of American forces, coupled with talk of no compromise, means that the United States is now pointed towards a war with Iraq that will be largely an American war, fought predominantly by Americans, in which (on our side) mostly Americans will die—and for interests that are neither equally vital nor urgent to America and which, in any case, can be and should be effectively pursued by other, less drastic and less bloody means.

Let me amplify on that last point.

The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait required a response to three major challenges to our interests:

1. It threatened our access to reasonably priced oil supplies—a matter of vital and urgent interest—and hence a unilateral American military response to protect Saudi Arabia would have been justified, even to the point of waging war;

2. It affronted the international order through the annexation of Kuwait, a matter of concern to the entire international community, a transgression that truly deserves punishment and that must be undone—but it is not an issue that demands an urgent American military response ahead of the international community and largely at American cost;

3. It raised the question of the regionally destabilizing character of Iraq's military power, an issue of obvious long-range importance that should first be addressed, if possible, through an attempt at a broader regional accommodation and not now through a preventive war.

In my view, we have already had a responding success in responding to the first challenge; the sanctions are a punitive response to the second and should therefore be maintained for as long as necessary; and in the process preconditions are being generated for the eventual resolution by the international community of the wider issue of regional stability, especially as Iraq is being economically weakened and Saddam Hussein's power is being gradually undermined. This is why I feel that there is no urgent or vital American interest to go beyond punitive deterrence. In a word, war is not necessary.

Yet to justify military action, the Administration, echoing the advocates of war, have lately been relying on the emotionally charged argument that we confront a present danger because of the possibility that Iraq may at some point acquire a nuclear capability. In other words, not oil, not Kuwait—but Iraq's nuclear program has become the latest excuse for moving towards war.

This argument deserves careful scrutiny. The nuclear issue is of particular and understandable concern to Israel and its friends. Many of those who argue for preventive war give this matter the highest priority and derive their case therefrom. It is obviously an issue not to be taken lightly.

Nonetheless, once subjected to closer scrutiny, this latest case for war also does not meet the tests of vitality or urgency to the American national interest. First of all, it is relevant to note that when the United States was threatened directly by the far more powerful and dangerous Stalinist Russia or Maoist China, it refrained from engaging in preventive war. Moreover, Israel already has nuclear weapons and can thus deter Iraq, while the United States has certainly both the power to deter or to destroy Iraq. Deterrence has worked in the past and I fail to see why thousands of Americans should now die in order to make sure that at some point in the future—according to experts, some years from now—Iraq does not acquire a militarily significant nuclear capability.

Second, it is within our power to sustain a comprehensive embargo on Iraq to impede such an acquisition. Unlike India or Israel, Iraq does permit international inspection of its nuclear facilities. This gives us some insight into its program. Moreover, much can happen during the next several years, including Saddam's fall from power. Hence the precipitation of war now on these grounds meets neither the criterion of urgency nor vitality.

More than that, war would be highly counterproductive to the American national interest. A war is likely to split the international consensus that currently exists, the United States is likely to become estranged from many of its European allies, and it is almost certain to become the object of widespread Arab hostility. Indeed, once started, the war may prove not all that easy to terminate, given the inflammable character of Middle Eastern politics. It could be costly in blood and financially devastating.

This prospect is all the more tragic because the United States would thereby be deprived of the fruits of its hard-earned victory in the Cold War. We stand today on the threshold of a historic opportunity to shape a truly cooperative world order, based on genuine cooperation and respect for human rights. Yet our over-reaction to the crisis in the Persian Gulf is now adversely affecting both our priorities and our principles.

On the level of priorities, some of the funds being spent on the greatest U.S. military overseas deployment since the landings in Normandy might be better spent addressing some of our domestic problems which for decades we have had to neglect. Moreover, we surely should be doing more to ensure the success of democracy in the post-communist countries—a stake of truly historic magnitude. A costly military action will divert us even further from the needed responses to these challenges.

On the level of principle, one cannot help but worry that we may be buying support for our military undertaking by sacrificing Lebanon for Assad's cooperation, the Baltic peoples for Gorbachev's, the Chinese dissidents for Li Peng's, and perhaps the Eritreans for Mengistu's. And we are doing so because in fact the international community is not pressing for military action, but the Administration wants to obtain that community's sanction so that it can argue at home on behalf of military action by pointing to the international support that the Administration has thereby marshaled.

THE DILEMMAS OF WAR

In any case, it is war that soon we may have to face because of the combined pressures resulting from Iraqi intransigence, the imposition of a deadline, the lack of patience in the application of sanctions, and the consequences of massive troop deployments.

Given the possibility, therefore, that the United States might be plunged by a Presidential decision into a war with Iraq, I would urge this Committee to examine carefully in its deliberations, and to press the Administration for answers regarding the following three clusters of critically important issues:

1. What are the political limits and the likely geopolitical dynamics of war, once the President decides to initiate it?

For example, one has to be concerned that the use of air power in order to mitigate casualties for U.S. ground forces will require the killing not only of the hostages but also of thousands—perhaps tens of thousands or even more—of Iraqi civilians, who are not to be held responsible for Saddam Hussein's flagrant misconduct. I wonder if this is politically viable, in terms of the longer-range relationship of America with the Moslem world. And is it morally admissible?

It is also not clear to me how the Administration envisages the termination of the war. Are we to expect a total surrender or are we counting on a negotiated outcome, after a spasm of violence? If a complete military victory becomes necessary, are we prepared to occupy all of Iraq, including the huge city of Baghdad? Are we logistically prepared for a war that is not promptly resolved by air power, and are we psychologically for heavy American casualties?

Also, once war begins, Iran and Syria may not remain passive and the war could thus spread. One has to anticipate the possibility that Iraq will seek to draw Israel into the war. Does the Administration have a contingency plan in the event that Jordan becomes a battlefield? What might be the U.S. reaction if some Israeli leaders seek to take advantage of an expended war to effect the expulsion of all Palestinians from their homes on the West Bank? The Gulf crisis and the Arab-Israeli conflict could thus become linked, our efforts to the contrary notwithstanding.

I believe the Administration is paying insufficient attention to these inherent uncertainties of war. The war could prove more destructive, more bloody, and more difficult to terminate than Administration spokesmen—not to speak of sundry private advocates of war—seem to think. I also believe the Administration has not given sufficient thought to the geopolitically disruptive consequences of a war in a region that is extraordinarily incendiary. An American military invasion of Iraq would be likely to set off a chain reaction that could bog America down in a variety of prolonged security operations, in a setting of intensified political instability.

2. What are the likely broader after-effects of the war?

The Administration is yet to move beyond vague generalities regarding its concept of the postwar Middle East. Yet considerable anxiety is justified that subsequent to the war the United States might not be able to extricate itself from the Middle Eastern cauldron, especially if in the meantime the Arab masses have become radicalized and hostile to the Arab regimes that endorsed the U.S. Military action. How will that affect America's global position? I would think it likely that, with the United States embroiled in the Middle Eastern mess for years to come, both Europe and Japan—free to promote their own agendas—will pursue the enhancement of their economic power. In the region itself, it is probable that fundamentalist Iran will become the dominant power in the Persian Gulf, and that terrorist Syria will inherit the mantle of leadership among

the Arabs. It is also possible that the destruction of Iraq by America and the resulting radicalization of the Arabs might leave Israel, armed as it already is with nuclear weapons, more tempted to use its military force to impose its will in this volatile region. How will all this affect the area's sensitive balance of power?

I believe that none of the above possible developments would be in the American interest. Yet I do not sense that sufficient strategic planning has been devoted by the Administration to an analysis of the wider shock effects of a war that is bound to be exploited by other parties for their own selfish ends.

3. Finally what is being done to ensure that the war's burdens and sacrifices are more fairly distributed among its potential beneficiaries or participants?

One cannot help but be struck by the relatively limited contributions of our allies. Moreover, as I understand it, some states with forces in Saudi Arabia have indicated that they will not participate in offensive operations. The American public certainly is not satisfied with the financial support extended by Germany and Japan. Is the Administration satisfied? What additional financial contribution can be expected from the Saudis and the Kuwaitis? It is noteworthy that Saudi Arabia has already benefited very substantially from the oil crisis, and that the Emir of Kuwait and his family are in the forefront of those arguing for Americans to initiate military action. Are we thus—despite all of our rhetoric about “the new international order”—not running the risk of becoming the mercenaries in this war, applauded and financed by others to do the fighting and the dying for them?

I believe that is already evident that the principal sacrifices of war—both financial and in blood—will in fact have to be borne by America, and to a massively disproportionate degree. Such evident unfairness will inevitably have a very adverse impact on American attitudes towards its allies, with deleterious consequences for American public support for the so-called “international order”.

These are tough issues. And unless the Administration responds to them satisfactorily, the war will lack domestic support while generating polarizing political passions. Even worse, unless the Administration thinks hard about such questions, it could embark on a course deeply damaging to our national interest.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude with a word about the lessons of history. It is important to apply them with a sense of proportion. To speak of Saddam Hussein as a Hitler is to trivialize Hitler and to elevate Saddam. Iraq is not Germany—but a middle-sized country, on the scale of—say—Rumania, dependent on the export of one commodity for most of its income, unable on its own either to fully feed itself or to construct its own weapons. It is a threat to regional peace—a threat with wider global economic implications—but it is a threat we can contain, deter, or repel, as the situation dictates.

Therefore, in my view, neither an American war to liberate Kuwait nor a preventive war to destroy Iraq's power is urgently required, be it in terms of the American national interest or of the imperatives of world order. President Bush's initial commitment to punish Iraq and to deter it remains the wisest course—and one which this nation can resolutely and in unity sustain over the long haul. By any rational calculus, the tradeoffs between the discomforts of patience and the costs of war favor patience. Both time and

power are in our favor—and we do not need to be driven by artificial deadlines, deceptive arguments, or irrational emotion into an unnecessary war.

THE FAIRNESS IN BROADCASTING ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing, together with Mr. MARKEY, a bill to codify the fairness doctrine. As many will recall, the Federal Communications Commission voted to repeal the fairness doctrine in 1987. That decision was contrary to the will of the Congress, and was the subject of legislation to reinstate the doctrine almost immediately. Regrettably, President Reagan vetoed the legislation, and as a result broadcasters are no longer required to abide by this important policy.

The fairness doctrine consists of a relatively simple set of requirements for broadcasters. First, it contains a requirement that broadcasters address significant issues of public importance. Second, it requires that when doing so, broadcasters must treat issues fairly. It is a minimal safeguard against abuse by those who have been given broadcast licenses by the Government, and is a policy supported by many broadcasters themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the House has voted repeatedly to codify the fairness doctrine. Support for this measure has been bipartisan, reflecting the strong support for the doctrine from people as far apart as Ralph Nader and Phyllis Schlafly. It is my hope that we will be able to put this issue behind us this year, and move on to deal with the many other important issues that face telecommunications policy-makers.

GERMAN PROFESSORS APPEAL FOR A PEACEFUL SOLUTION TO THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received the following message calling upon President Bush to exercise every possible effort to obtain a political solution to the crisis caused by the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

This message, subscribed to by some 400 professors representing 90 different disciplines at German universities, suggests that war would result in the deaths of “thousands of soldiers, many of them American, and also large numbers of women and children would be killed * * *”

These educators continue, Mr. Speaker, to state that, “We condemn in the most decisive terms possible the aggression and breaches of human rights perpetrated by the Iraqi regime. The correct response to its crimes, however, is not a war whose sheer extent would make it a crime of a far greater order.”

I am in agreement that, in order to save even one life, not to mention the thousands sure to perish in war with Iraq, we must leave no stone unturned. As I suggested to President Bush in a recent letter, we should not even rule out personal efforts by our Nation's leader to mediate this confrontation before making the grave and profound choice of armed intervention.

The text of the professors' appeal follows, Mr. Speaker, and I commend their plea to the attention of the membership.

DECEMBER 19, 1990.

HON. GEORGE BUSH,

To the President of the United States of America.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We hereby present to you an Appeal on the Gulf Crisis signed by some 400 professors from 90 different disciplines at various German universities.

Our appeal is directed also to the Congress of the United States of America. In the Federal Republic of Germany we intend to present our views to the Ambassador of the United States of America and to inform the Federal Government.

With our highest appreciation we remain.

Yours Sincerely,

Prof. Dr. K. Bonhoeffer, Prof. Dr. H.E. Richter, Prof. Dr. A. Buro, Prof. Dr. M. Stohr, Prof. Dr. A. Flitner.

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

This appeal is directed to you by citizens of Germany—a country from which, half a century ago, a criminal dictator precipitated the world into the carnage of the Second World War. At that time, there was no viable institution such as today's United Nations and hence no measure such as a united trade embargo to bring this inhumane regime to its knees by non-military means.

Now that the East-West conflict has been overcome, the world community of nations for the first time has the power to counter aggressors by concerted sanctions. It seems quite out of the question that Saddam Hussein can, in the long term, withstand the pressure of the effective economic blockade decided on and enforced by UN resolution.

And yet the world is at present witnessing the preparations for an international war—a war in which thousands of soldiers, many of them American, and also large numbers of women and children would be killed, a war which would unavoidably affect millions upon millions of people and nations outside the immediate area, and which would inflict incalculable damage upon the ecology. The fact that the likely deployment by Iraq of chemical weapons has been made possible by exports from, of all sources, our own country is something which fills us as Germans with shame.

We condemn in the most decisive terms possible the aggression and breaches of human rights perpetrated by the Iraqi regime. The correct response to its crimes, however, is not a war whose sheer extent would make it a crime of a far greater order.

In this situation we appeal to you with all urgency to seek, hand in hand with the United Nations, not a military but a political solution in the Gulf—a solution which would at one and the same time move forward the peace process in the entire Middle East region. The USA, as a world power, should at the earliest possible opportunity seize the initiative for a Middle East peace conference.

A peaceful solution, we believe, entails that the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Ku-

wait be facilitated by the other side—through an immediate withdrawal of those troops stationed for offensive purposes.

We urge you to prevent, come what may, the catastrophe of a war which—quite apart from its terrifying consequences for human life, the ecology and the economy—would be a relapse into the militaristic power thinking which has hitherto deprived humankind of the physical and moral energy required to jointly combat both mass poverty and the deadly threats to our environment.

For the initiators,

Prof. HORST-EBERHARD
RICHTER.
Prof. ANDREAS FLITNER.

EVENT IN LITHUANIA

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by the recent tragic turn of events in Lithuania, and I condemn the Soviet Union's suppression of Lithuania's democratically elected government.

Only last week, I joined with a number of my colleagues in writing to President Bush and to the Soviet Ambassador to protest the deployment of Soviet troops to the republics. We especially expressed our concern to the Ambassador that Moscow was abandoning its commitment to glasnost and perestroika, and warned of the consequences for United States-Soviet relations if steps were not taken to resolve this matter nonviolently. Unfortunately, it would appear that former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's warning of a reactionary crackdown in the republics was accurate.

The Soviet Union's attack on nonviolent protesters and their chosen government warrants a strong United States response. A suspension of current American assistance to the Soviet Union would demonstrate that we will assist President Gorbachev only if he remains committed to restructuring his economy and respecting democratic freedoms. That commitment would be best demonstrated by an announcement from President Gorbachev that he will reopen a dialogue with elected leaders in Lithuania.

Currently, President Bush is scheduled to hold a summit with Gorbachev next month. I hope that he will use that occasion to express the depth of American concern regarding these events, and to warn of the consequences for United States-Soviet relations.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT M. DIVELY

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a constituent of mine, Mr. Robert M. Dively of Port Matilda, PA.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Dively in which he included a poem he wrote in tribute

to the U.S. flag. Written on July 4, 1990, Mr. Dively creatively reminds us through his rhyme of the true meaning and glory imbedded in this symbol of our Nation. It has been published in local papers and was also given a 4th place award in world competition. I am very pleased to recognize Mr. Dively for his accomplishments and to publish his poem here for all to enjoy.

I AM YOUR FLAG

I rose high after many battles, by those who shared my pride,
Their weary eyes came wet with tears as we remembered those who died.

Children pledge my radiant colors as the school day does begin
and I hope their learning of the day will remember where I've been.

I adored the soldier and his God as he carried me place to place
and I hate those who burn me and try to shame my face.

To some I am not important and my past is soon forgot
but most know my true symbol and they will scorn me not.

My dream is for the future where all will live in trust,
as my waving arms reach out to those whose bodies turn to dust.

I am just a cloth of colors designed by those who cared to share
the hardships of our free land, the bravery and the dares.

Draped over a lonely casket my thoughts run long and deep
as I'm handed to a sad kin who tries to hold a weep.

In the many times of trouble I am lifted to the sky
and the famous who have honored me half mast will never die.

Tired and weary as I am I still remain the same
and as long as liberty has respect the fools will make no gain.

Freedom had its deadly price, which I am its very bound
and I pray to God in heaven a lasting peace will soon be found.

—Written July 4, 1990,
ROBERT M. DIVELY.

REPRESSION IN BALTICS MUST STOP

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Soviet troops opened fire on unarmed civilians in Lithuania. This unprovoked assault led to the death or injury of numerous innocent people whose only crime was the desire for democracy.

Today, in Latvia, we saw the continuation of the Soviet crackdown in the Baltic Republics. Soviet elite troops stormed a police building beating the Latvian cadets inside and seizing their weapons. This escalation of violence and repression by Communist authorities cannot be allowed to continue.

President Gorbachev contends that he did not order the recent violence in Lithuania and

Latvia. While this may or may not be true, he certainly created the environment in which it took place. He must be held accountable for these actions.

I fear that the world has watched passively as Gorbachev consolidated the powers of State control to a degree only surpassed by Josef Stalin. Will he now use this power to destroy the perestroika and glasnost which he created?

In the past year the world has seen a tragic and violent mistake by a dictator in the Middle East. I strongly urge President Gorbachev to avoid calling down the same world reaction on his Government. The repression must halt, the Soviet troops must be withdrawn, and a negotiated settlement must be found, or relations between our two nations will suffer immeasurably.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTHDAY OF REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I address this body today with mixed emotions. On one hand, I am proud to stand here and offer a tribute to one of the great leaders of this Nation and an outstanding peace activist, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who would have turned 62 today. On the other hand, I am distressed by the events in the Persian Gulf and the fact that the President has chosen this day of all days, to draw the line in the sand for Iraq's Saddam Hussein.

Dr. King devoted his life to the quest for equality, justice, and peace. It is a sad irony that on the day we celebrate the birth and the life work of a world renowned humanitarian, we may fire the first strike in what will be a deadly, devastating war.

Most of us are well aware of Dr. King's efforts to help this country overcome the divisiveness of hatred and bigotry, and to become, instead, a Nation united under the banner of humanity.

Less well known is that, especially in the last few years of his life, Dr. King was also committed to a peaceful and expeditious resolution to United States involvement in the Vietnam war. I dare say that if Dr. King were alive today, he would be a vociferous opponent of both the military aggression of Saddam Hussein and of the move toward war by the United States.

Dr. King opposed the war and endured a great deal of criticism for his position. But he saw that the war in Vietnam and the struggle for civil rights here were inextricably linked. Among the difficulties Dr. King had with the Vietnam war, he could not answer the questions posed to him by black GI's. They asked why they should fight—and perhaps die—alongside white soldiers, against a people who had never hurt them, for peace and justice in a nation thousands of miles away. Because when these black GI's returned home to America they would not enjoy the full rights and privileges of citizenship as those same

white soldiers, nor enjoy the freedoms that they were fighting to uphold for those people so far away.

Dr. King was a minister by profession, one who believed in and taught the sanctity of all human life. Building on this tenet, he noted in a speech in April 1967 that he felt that the Nobel Prize for Peace, which he was awarded in 1964, placed a responsibility on him to work toward peace for all mankind. Were our goals in Vietnam—or in the Persian Gulf—worth 1, 100, or 1,000 of our sons and daughters?

As a minister, Dr. King was also concerned about the spirit and soul of people and nations. He was concerned about the massive doses of violence the United States was heaping upon the people of Vietnam. He worried that the violence of the war itself and the way it was tearing apart families and friends here at home were "poison[ing] America's soul" and this was too heavy a toll to take on the Nation.

It is sad to note that just 24 years after Dr. King raised our consciousness about the war in Vietnam, we are again looking at United States involvement in another round of military hostilities. Now more than ever, we need to reflect on the life and teachings of Dr. King and his message of nonviolent change. Now more than ever, we need to heed the call for restraint and deliberation.

ADMIRAL CROWE ON U.S. POLICY
IN THE GULF

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, with the U.N. deadline for the Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait 1 day away, I continue to work and hope for a peaceful solution to the crisis. I believe that there is no quick solution to this issue that an offensive military action by the United States, at this time would be premature.

I submit for the RECORD the following congressional testimony by Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr., USN (Ret). Admiral Crowe served as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under Presidents Reagan and Bush; and he shares my views that economic sanctions should be given more than 5 months to have an impact. In addition, he notes that deposing Saddam Hussein will not be a panacea for the problems in the Middle East.

STATEMENT BY ADM. WILLIAM J. CROWE, JR., USN (RET.) BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES U.S. SENATE, NOVEMBER 28, 1990

Mr. Chairman, given U.S. interests in the Persian Gulf and Saddam Hussein's brutal takeover of Kuwait, the subject of U.S. policy in the region is of the utmost importance to all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I do have some preliminary remarks I would like to make. Due to the press of time these will not deal with all aspects of the subject, but concentrate largely on the impact of the crisis on the gulf region. I assume, of course, the question period will range over the entire spectrum of considerations.

You would think we would have had a decent interval to celebrate the end of the Cold

War and the vindication of our policies and values. But the recent events in the Middle East have demonstrated that the globe is still a dangerous place and that new threats may well replace the United States-Soviet contest.

Our difficulties with Iraq certainly suggest the type of challenge the new world may confront.

The most distinguishing feature of our disagreement with Iraq is that the Soviets are not backing Saddam Hussein. For the first time in 40 years we are confronting a major international crisis and not working at cross purposes with the Kremlin. This development has given the President an unprecedented latitude for maneuver and, in turn, severely constrained Baghdad's options. This is the first time a post-war President has had such a luxury.

President Bush has taken full advantage of the new-found maneuvering room. He reacted quickly and, in my opinion, correctly, to constrain Hussein militarily to defend Saudi Arabia and to clamp a tight economic quarantine on Iraq.

Some of the major important early achievements were ones that the President had a large hand in himself, e.g., gaining access to Saudi Arabia for our forces (a previously unheard of concession), forging a rough political consensus among the leaders of NATO, the USSR and Japan, and encouraging a pan-Arab military effort in support of Saudi Arabia. We are for the time being, witnessing a remarkable display of collective political and financial support which is unprecedented in the post-war era. President Bush deserves full credit for this achievement.

Militarily, the United States has mounted an impressive deployment—with air, sea and ground forces. No other nation in the world could have in 60 days moved this size force 8,000 miles and put it in the field—not to mention the rather trying climate and topography in which it must operate. On balance the original deployment went extremely well.

As to the economic embargo, it is the first time we have been able to mount truly unified sanctions. No embargoed material is moving into Iraq by sea, and the air blockade is proving relatively effective. Undoubtedly there is some leakage—probably on the ground from Jordan and Iran—but I know of no significant breaks in the encirclement.

It is important to recognize what has been achieved thus far:

Some pundits contend that Saddam Hussein's primary goal is to control the bulk of the Middle East oil and to dictate the price of crude to the West. If that is correct, any such design has been frustrated. He has been served clear notice that he will not be allowed to capture the Saudi oil fields either now or in the future. A definite line has been drawn constraining him and his inflated ambitions.

The increased oil income Saddam had in mind has not materialized. In fact, Baghdad has forfeited 20 billion dollars of foreign exchange earnings a year and as Secretary Schlesinger pointed out, this figure would be \$30 billion at the current oil price. In a country the size of Iraq that is not chopped liver.

Moreover, it has been graphically demonstrated that the West can live rather well without Iraqi and Kuwaiti oil. Granted some special areas of refined products are strapped, but those deficiencies are not having a heavy impact on the industrial nations. Frankly, the price swings we see have been generated as much by psychological factors

as by supply and demand. We have been impacted by these oscillations, but fortuitously the bill has already been paid as the market has adjusted. Iraq cannot make that claim.

The embargo is biting heavily. Given the standard of living Iraq is used to and the increasing sophistication of Iraqi society, it is dead wrong to say that Baghdad is not being hurt; it is being damaged severely. That goes for the Iraqi military as well, which depends on outside support. Yesterday Secretary Schlesinger elaborated on these impacts. Iraq's civilian production has declined by 40 percent, exports earnings have sharply dropped, and economic flexibility is rapidly disappearing. Military industry will likewise be hit. It is the most effective peacetime blockade ever levied.

Granted that the embargo is not working as rapidly as many would prefer; but if we wanted results in two or three months, clearly a quarantine was the wrong way to go about it. Most experts believe that it will work with time. Estimates range in the neighborhood of twelve to eighteen months. In other words, the issue is not whether an embargo will work, but whether we have the patience to let it take effect.

Ultimately these trends will translate into political pressure. I genuinely believe we are already seeing the first signs that Saddam Hussein is seeking a way out—a face-saving way to withdraw.

Moreover, the logistic support that Iraq used to enjoy will never return to the past levels of generosity, if at all. Hussein has excited the resentment, contempt and suspicion of the nations he historically depended upon. In essence, under no circumstances can Iraq return to the world it left on August 2 and when the dust clears we must reinforce that outcome.

In sum, the President's initial moves have already achieved a great deal. The argument that Saddam is winning and being rewarded is both weird and wrong. Obviously this fact is often overlooked by those calling for more direct action.

It is true that the trauma is by no means over. The burning question now confronting the President (as well as the public) is what next? This is no mean question nor is it an easy one. In its most extreme form, we are talking about deliberately initiating offensive military operations—in other words, war. This is always a grave decision and one which deserves both deep thought and wide public discussion.

If Saddam Hussein initiates an attack on Saudi Arabia or U.S. forces, we have no choice but to react vigorously and to use force to bring Iraq to heel. I believe such a response would be defensible and acceptable to all constituencies, domestic and international. For that reason alone it is unlikely that Saddam Hussein will initiate further military action. Certainly everything we see to date suggests he is hunkering down for the long haul. If that prediction proves correct, President Bush will be confronted with some painful choices.

If deposing Saddam Hussein would sort out the Middle East and permit the U.S. to turn its attention elsewhere, and to concentrate on our domestic problems, the case for initiating offensive action would be considerably strengthened.

But the Middle East is not that simple. Put bluntly, Saddam's departure or any other single act will not make everything wonderful. In fact, a close look at the Middle East is rather depressing. While we may wish it otherwise, the fact is that the region has been, is, and will be for the foreseeable fu-

ture plagued with a host of problems, tensions, enmities, and disagreements. For example:

The Arab-Israeli dispute is alive and well. To say the least the Palestinians have been irrevocably alienated by the Israeli government's policies. There will never be true stability in the area until this dispute is sorted out.

As Henry Schuler phrased it, "Neither the feudal monarchies nor the oppressive dictatorships enjoy the stability of an institutionalized popular mandate of political participation." This suggests that political maturity, hence stability, is still a long way off.

Income differences on both national and individual levels are a constant source of tensions and envy throughout the region. I lived in the Gulf in 1976 and 1977 and witnessed this friction at close hand.

Moslem fundamentalism is spreading and the process highlights the cultural, religious and ethnic differences that abound in the area as well as the widespread distrust of the West.

Boundary disputes are legion: Qatar vs. Bahrain, Abu Dhabi vs. Oman and Saudi Arabia, Yemen vs. Saudi Arabia, Kuwait vs. Iraq.

U.S. links to Israel and the dominant position of American oil companies have turned large segments of the Arab world against the U.S. in particular.

The current crisis has divided the moderate Arab states for the first time, e.g., Saudi Arabia has now split with Jordan and Yemen (now the most populous state on the peninsula at 10+ million) over their support for Iraq. This does not bode well for the cause of stability or pluralism—both of which U.S. interests.

These frictions—singly or collectively—have resulted in a succession of explosions, assassinations, global terrorism, coups, revolutions, producer embargoes, and full scale war on occasion. Secretary Schlesinger summed it up when he said the non-combat costs or recourse to war will be substantial.

Like it or not, the process of bringing stability to the Middle East will be painful and protracted with or without Saddam Hussein.

Moreover, the U.S., both as a leader of the free world and as the world's number one consumer of crude oil, will be integrally involved in the region, politically and economically, for the foreseeable future—just as we have been for the past forty years. It may not make us comfortable, but there is no way we can avoid this burden; it comes with our affluence and global reach.

This reality suggests that anything we do in that part of the world should be consistent with our past policies and our future role as an international leader. Put another way, today's problem is a great deal more complex than merely defeating Saddam Hussein.

In my view, the critical foreign policy questions we must ask are not whether Saddam Hussein is a brutal, deceitful or dreadful man—he is all of those things—but whether initiating conflict against Iraq will moderate the larger difficulties in the Gulf region and will put Washington in a better position to work with the Arab world in the future. I would submit that posturing ourselves to promote stability for the long term is our primary national interest in the Middle East.

It is not obvious to me that we are currently looking at the crisis in this light. Our dislike for Hussein seems to have crowded out many other considerations.

In working through the problems myself, I am persuaded that the U.S. initiating hos-

tilities could well exacerbate many of the tensions I have cited and further polarize the Arab world.

Certainly many Arabs would deeply resent a campaign which would necessarily kill large numbers of their Muslim brothers and force them to choose sides. From the Arab perspective this fight is not simply a matter between bad and good; it's a great deal more complex than that and includes political and social perspectives deeply rooted in Arab History. The aftermath of such a contest will very likely multiply many fold the anti-America resentment in the Middle East. In essence we may be on the horns of a nowin dilemma, even if we win we lose ground in the Arab world and further injure our ability to deal with the labyrinth of the Middle East.

I firmly believe that Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait. At the same time given the larger context I judge it highly desirable to achieve this goal in a peaceful fashion, if possible. In other words, we should give sanctions a fair chance before we discard them. I personally believe they will bring him to his knees, but I would be the first to admit that is a speculative judgment. If in fact the sanctions will work in twelve to eighteen months instead of six months, the trade-off of avoiding war with its attendant sacrifices and uncertainties would, in my view, be more than worth it.

A part of this effort, however, must be a strong military posture both to underwrite our determination and to give effect to the embargo. Of course, it may be necessary to return to a rotation policy to sustain such a presence. If the sanctions do not live up to their promise or if they collapse, then a military solution would be the only recourse, and we would be well placed to mount such a campaign. In any event, I am convinced that such an action will be much better received if we have visibly exhausted our peaceful alternatives.

If we elect a military option, I have utter confidence that our forces can prevail. It will not be cost free, of course. Casualties and the time schedule will depend on innovation, our military objectives and Iraqi determination. We cannot assume that Iraq will roll over.

Let us say a word about our objectives. It was my experience as Chairman that to get decision-makers to settle on specific military objectives was difficult at best. There is a strong tendency to talk in generalities when contemplating combat, but that is not satisfactory. In this case, what would we expect our commanders to do—drive to Baghdad, free Kuwait, destroy Iraqi forces, eliminate his nuclear capability, or all of the above, etc. The character of your objectives influences the whole operation and your tactical plans. The more ambitious the goals are the less likely a peaceful solution can be found, the greater the casualties, the lengthier the campaign, and the more difficult postwar reconstruction. I would strongly advise that our combat objectives run along these lines.

An intense air campaign aimed at disrupting his war-making industry—including nuclear installations, conventional warfare, and biological weapons facilities.

A subsequent ground campaign designed: To cut off Kuwait and subsequently free it and

To destroy the effectiveness of the Iraqi forces both in Kuwait and on the southern border of Iraq.

I recognize that some would consider those objectives too limited. I disagree. These goals, if achieved, would deal Saddam Hus-

sein a crushing political and military blow and dispel any further ambitions he might have to dominate either the Middle East or the global oil market. The point is to succeed with minimum effort, casualties, and political cost.

I understand that many believe our troops, our people and our allies don't have the necessary patience to wait out the quarantine. Militarily we have already lost the element of surprise; Saddam Hussein knows we are there. I believe our relative military position improves every day. It's curious that some expect our military to train soldiers to stand up to hostile fire, but doubt its ability to train them to wait patiently.

I am aware, of course, that many are concerned about the task of holding the domestic and international consensus together. While there will be grumbling, I believe the bulk of the American people are willing to put up with a lot to avoid casualties a long way from home. Similarly, I cannot understand why some consider our international alliance strong enough to conduct intense hostilities but too fragile to hold together while we attempt a peaceful solution. Actually, I sense more nervousness among our allies about our impetuosity than about our patience.

In closing, I would make a few observations that perhaps we should keep in mind as we approach this process:

Using economic pressure may prove protracted; but if it could avoid hostilities or casualties those are also highly desirable ends. As a matter of fact, they are also national interests.

It is curious that, just as our patience in Western Europe has paid off and furnished us the most graphic example in our history of how staunchness is sometimes the better course in dealing with thorny international problems, armchair strategists are counseling a near-term attack on Iraq. It is worth remembering that in the '50s and '60s, similar individuals were advising an attack on the USSR—wouldn't that have been great?

Time often has a way of achieving unexpected results. Already there are reports that the Palestinians in Kuwait, having witnessed Saddam's cruelty, are turning away from him and that others in Jordan are also having second thoughts. I am reminded how time changed the Panamanian population's view of Noriega. Autocrats often have a talent for alienating even friends and supporters.

Mr. Chairman, it may be that Saddam Hussein's ego is so engaged that he will not bend to an embargo or other peaceful deterrents such as containment. But I believe we should thoroughly satisfy ourselves that that is in fact the case and that hostilities would best serve our interests before resorting to unilateral offensive action against Iraq. It would be a sad commentary if Saddam Hussein, a two-bit tyrant who sits on 17 million people and possesses a GNP of \$40 billion, proved to be more patient than the United States, the world's most affluent and powerful nation.

A TRIBUTE TO THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF MAYOR LIONEL J. WILSON AND COMMENDING HIM ON HIS MERITORIOUS SERVICE TO THE CITIZENS OF OAKLAND

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the dedicated and truly committed career of Mayor Lionel J. Wilson. Mayor Wilson's career of public service has been marked by extraordinary progress in achieving the goals of the Oakland renaissance and in the achievement of our hopes for a wonderful and prosperous future for the city of Oakland, CA.

Mayor Wilson has served the citizens of Oakland from July 1977 to January 1991. His 13 years of outstanding accomplishment are characterized by responsible leadership and compassion for the citizens of our city. Mayor Wilson's legacy includes over \$1 billion in completed major construction projects, the nationally recognized Interagency Council on Drugs, a revitalized Oakland Private Industry Council, and community involvement in the University of California-Oakland Metropolitan Forum, the Coliseum Commerce Center Corp., the Minority/Community Equity Participation Task Force, the mayor's Hunger Relief Program, the mayor's Tennis Excellence Program, the mayor's Summer Jobs Program, the mayor's Trust/Earthquake Relief Fund, and the mayor's Toy Drive; all of which has improved the quality of life for our citizens and is a model for our Nation's cities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker for this opportunity to address the House in celebration of Mayor Lionel J. Wilson's exemplary career of service to his community and Nation.

**FREEDOM OF CHOICE ACT
PROVIDES NATIONAL STANDARD**

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, the first day of the 102d Congress, I introduced H.R. 25, the Freedom of Choice Act, with a bipartisan group of over 80 Members of the House. Today, that number has grown to 100, with more cosponsors being added each day.

One of the first to sign on as a cosponsor was the gentleman from California, Congressman TOM CAMPBELL. Our colleague was also a persuasive witness in behalf of the bill at hearings held last year by the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, which I chair.

In an insightful commentary in the Country Almanac of Menlo Park, CA, Congressman CAMPBELL sets forth the reasons why enactment of the Freedom of Choice Act is imperative.

As our colleague notes,

Women need a more solid assurance of their right to choose. They need to know

that their right to choose an abortion cannot be instantly overturned by a Supreme Court decision.

Enactment of H.R. 25 would provide that assurance. The Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights intends to make passage of the Freedom of Choice Act a high priority for the 102d Congress. As work on this important legislation continues, I very much appreciate the support of the gentleman from California, and I call to the attention of my colleagues his thoughtful comments.

The article follows:

[From Country Almanac, Dec. 26, 1990]

**FREEDOM OF CHOICE PROPOSAL NEEDS TO
HAVE HIGH PRIORITY**

(By Congressman Tom Campbell)

For almost two decades, we who favor a woman's right to choose an abortion allowed ourselves to become perhaps a bit too complacent. After the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*, we were comforted by the knowledge that every woman in America could make her own choice.

But the Supreme Court's decision in *Webster* last year woke us up. We were given a harsh reminder that abortion rights rested on a single Supreme Court decision—a decision many constitutional scholars were predicting would be soon overturned. We were reminded that the right to choose hangs by little more than a judicial thread.

Women need a more solid assurance of their right to choose. They need to know that their right to choose an abortion cannot be instantly overturned by a Supreme Court decision.

The solution lies in federal legislation. A well-drafted bill would be much less likely ever to be overturned by a court decision. It would give permanent, statutory assurance of the right of choice.

The Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee recently held hearings on a bill that would do just that. I was pleased to have the opportunity to testify in favor of that bill. H.R. 3700, the Freedom of Choice Act. The bill would guarantee the right of any woman in America to choose an abortion at any time before fetal viability or whenever her life is in danger.

The bill, sponsored primarily by my colleague, Rep. Don Edwards of San Jose, and co-sponsored by 127 other members, would be a national solution, not a piecemeal, state-by-state approach. If passed, the Freedom of Choice Act would be the most solid assurance we could give a woman that her right to choose would not be taken away.

While there is little likelihood the Freedom of Choice Act will be enacted this year, it should become a top priority for pro-choice advocates in the coming years. For those of us who are working for choice, this is the most important battle we must fight.

Polls show that the American people strongly support the right to choose. We need to translate that support into statutory assurance that no woman's right to an abortion will be taken away.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 will mark the 73d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. I am honored to join over 1 1/2 million Ukrainian Americans in celebrating the spirit of freedom within the Ukraine.

Amidst the dynamic changes occurring in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, Ukrainian Independence Day is a particularly important occasion. We will continue to work for the promise of glasnost and perestroika to be realized in freedoms to be enjoyed by all Ukrainians. We pray for a government receptive to open and productive dialog rather than confrontation and violence.

The unique cultural identity of the Ukraine is a source of pride to the more than 50 million Ukrainians all over the world. On January 22, we extend best wishes and thanks to the Ukraine for its important contributions to the world in the visual arts, folk music, religion, world view, literature, physical sciences, architecture—but above all the Ukraine's greatest contribution: Her people.

DIVIDED WE FALL

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, our identity as Americans is indeed difficult to define. We come in every size, shape, color, and culture. We have different interests; we eat different foods. But through it all, there is something that makes each of us American.

As a nation of immigrants, we have assembled possibly the most diverse society in the world; still, we have managed to make it work. We learn to respect, not fear, that which makes us different. We share our cultures, our food, and our heritages. We do this largely because we share a common tongue. We can communicate with each other.

Last month, Charles Krauthammer published a column entitled, "What's Left of the Left" in the Washington Post. That column is reprinted in the RECORD below. Mr. Krauthammer strikes a cord that is all too familiar when he points out the increasing fracturing of American society. We are now more diverse than ever, and now more than ever, it's important that we stand together. Like it or not, we are one nation, and the future of any one race or ethnic group is directly linked to the future of all other races and ethnic groups in America. Let us go forward into the future as unified whole, not as a fractured confederation.

Unity is as American as apple pie and enchiladas. Indeed, America was born of many peoples joining together in a common goal. With the stirrings of what would later become the birth of our nation, John Dickinson wrote, "Then join hand in hand, brave Americans all! / By uniting we stand, by dividing we fall."

[From the Washington Post, December 21, 1990]

WHAT'S LEFT OF THE LEFT; AFTER SOCIALISM. AN AGENDA FOR FRACTURING AMERICAN SOCIETY

By (Charles Krauthammer)

The Committee for the Free World, the most implacable and spirited anti-Communist voice in post-Vietnam America, closed shop this week. "We've won, goodbye," founder Midge Decter told *The Post's* E. J. Dionne. The most skeptical coroner has spoken. Communism is dead.

Another story, however, has been largely missed: socialism is dead too. At a recent gathering of the left (for a memorial tribute to radical historian William Appleman Williams), Christopher Lasch, with admirable candor, said: "We have to ask ourselves whether [Gorbachev] isn't presiding not just over the collapse of the Soviet empire but over the collapse of socialism as well. It is all very well to argue . . . that the socialist ideal was never to be confused with [Soviet-style] 'actually existing socialism.' But the whole point of Marxian socialism as distinguished from Utopian socialism, if anybody remembers, was precisely that it was not merely a speculative ideal."

Socialism, despite what Gorbachev pretends, was never the doctrine of loving thy neighbor as thyself. It is a political doctrine of class conflict rooted in a rejection of private property and a faith in "social control"—i.e., political control—of the means of production (factories, industry, etc.)

Well, the returns are in. Socialism is a prescription for economic ruin. Ruin not only where deformed by Stalinism but even where practiced with a human face. Tanzania's experiment in "African socialism" utterly destroyed a once self-sufficient economy. Even Israel's much idealized kibbutz movement faces insolvency. No serious country today looks to socialism as a model for development.

Accordingly, socialists have generally abandoned socialism and become social democrats. Social democrats want to humanize the market by attaching safety nets. A noble meliorism, but it is not socialism. It is liberalism. The socialist vision of new economic and social relations is finished.

But if socialism is finished, what's left on the left? How will it occupy its time? Judging from its recent activities, it is improvising well. Its agenda:

1) Earth. Environmentalism is a natural successor to Marxism. Europe's Green parties led the way, showing friends of the Earth the connection between opposition to development, on the one hand, and anti-nuclearism, anti-imperialism and anti-Americanism on the other.

There is a certain shamelessness in the left adopting the environment as its cause, considering *** the undecipherable environmental wreckage left by "actually existing socialism" in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Environmentalism is nonetheless the perfect escape hatch for the left because it enables the left to do precisely what it tried to do under the banner of socialism: allow educated elites to tell everyone else how to live. Social control, once asserted on behalf of the working class, is now asserted on behalf of the spotted owl.

2) Peace. With the Gulf crisis, the left (with some help from the isolationist right) has been busy trying to revive the long dormant antiwar movement. But here one gets the feeling of people going through the motions, of a reflexive, almost nostalgic anti-interventionism.

After all, the last time the peace movement got terribly exercised, it was to warn the world in panicked tones of the imminence of nuclear catastrophe and of the urgent need to take as many nuclear weapons as possible out of the hands of Ronald Reagan. Now that a Third World adventurer and thug—a man who has used weapons of mass destruction in the past and has pledged to use them again—is about to get his hands on a nuclear arsenal, the antiwar left can find no "just war" reason to disarm him.

This is more than inconsistency. This is bad faith. Hence, I suspect, the weakness of the peace movement so far.

3) The Balkanization of America. This is the major project of the left in the universities, the monastic refuge to which, like a defeated religious order, the radical left has retreated.

* * * * *

How? By proclaiming and championing a new oppressed, no longer the bloated and ungrateful working classes, but a new class of carefully selected ethnic and gender groups. Blacks, Hispanics, women, homosexuals, Native Americans—the list is long, the bids are open—are now wards of the left.

In their name is launched an all-out assault, first, on America's cultural past. As Prof. John Searle points out in the *New York Review of Books* (Dec. 6), the demand is not just for an expansion of the West's cultural canon to include works by women or people of color, but the destruction of this canon as representative of a white male-dominated system of cultural oppression.

So much for Western Civ. The other attack—on common citizenship—consists of the division of Americans into a hierarchy of legally preferred groups based on race and gender. From Canada to Lebanon, every other multi-ethnic society that has attempted such tribal stratification has come to grief. (Canada hangs by a thread, Lebanon has been shredded.) No matter. The left, helped by a nobly motivated but intellectually bankrupt "civil rights community," would march us just that way.

Of the three projects, Balkanization is the most serious. America will survive both Saddam and the snail darter. But the setting of one ethnic group against another, the fracturing not just of American society but of the American idea, poses a threat that no outside agent in this post-Soviet world can hope to match.

CONGRATULATIONS ON NIRPC'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission [NIRPC].

Since its inception in 1966, as the Lake-Porter County Regional Transportation and Planning Commission, NIRPC has played a vital role in the planning and coordination of northwest Indiana's public works' policy. NIRPC's role coordinating the often disparate interests and needs of various local governments through thoughtful planning for the future has improved the lives of every person that lives or passes through our area.

Their fine work on the Little Calumet River flood control project and the revitalization of the south shore's commuter service are only two examples of their importance to our community. There is little doubt that northwest Indiana would suffer without NIRPC's technical expertise.

We in northwest Indiana are keeping an eye on the future as we reflect on the success of NIRPC's past 25 years. As we enter the last decade of the 20th-century northwest Indiana is planning to boldly enter the 21st century with a coordinated mass transit and highway infrastructure, a more productive and diversified economy, and a better quality of life for its residents. NIRPC's vision and expertise will help guide our area into a prosperous decade and a successful future.

I would be remiss if I did not mention just a few of the people who have made NIRPC's first 25 years such a great success and guarantee at least another quarter century of accomplishment. The commission's first chairman, Dr. Joseph J. Forszt, and vice chairman, Virgil O. King, secretary William L. Staehle, executive director, Norman E. Tufford were essential in establishing and guiding the organization. NIRPC is currently under the direction of chairman, Mayor David Butterfield, vice-chairman, Mayor Elmo Gonzales, secretary, Karen Hughes, executive director, Jim Ranfranz—who served at NIRPC's inception as deputy director—and deputy director, Dan Gardner. The wide array of talent and ideas of these individuals and countless others has developed NIRPC's focus and promises its future success.

MAURICE STARR DAY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the wonderful work of famed record producer, Maurice Starr. Thursday, January 17, 1991, will be named "Maurice Starr Day" in the District of Columbia.

This day is being proclaimed in honor of Maurice Starr, better known as the General, in order to salute him for his efforts in making children's dreams come true and for his strong desire to maintain and continue to build entertainment empires in urban areas.

Born Larry Curtis Johnson, Maurice Starr is a musical genius and a multifaceted hit maker who plays 40 different instruments. Coming from a musical family, entertaining comes naturally to Starr. In addition to writing and producing the songs his acts record, Starr creates the acts, trains, manages, stages, markets, promotes, and grooms the acts for major stardom. It is no wonder that he is responsible for the formulation of some of today's hottest groups, such as, New Edition, Perfect Gentleman and New Kids on the Block.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will want to join me in extending our best wishes to Maurice Starr; a man that has made it a point to always give back to the community by pro-

viding the opportunity for stardom to urban area youths.

NATIONAL VOLUNTARY HEALTH CARE ACT

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated there are 32 to 37 million Americans without any form of health insurance. In addition, there are approximately 18 million Americans with minimal health care coverage.

The needs of the uninsured and the necessity of coping with the demand for long-term care are, at least in my estimation, the most pressing health care issues facing the country today. Because the cost of health insurance continues to skyrocket, there is a definite need to redefine our health care system so that the needs of all Americans are met.

I believe everyone should have access to decent and affordable health care. That is why I am reintroducing the National Voluntary Health Insurance Act. This measure is based on the system which is currently operating successfully in British Columbia, Canada. The plan would provide total coverage of all necessary medical and hospital care, without limits, exclusions or deductibles, for all Americans at about the same cost to the Government as the estimated present and projected cost of Medicare and Medicaid, which would be replaced.

I believe the program would provide a practical and effective means of stopping the present rapid inflation in hospital costs by greatly reducing administrative and malpractice insurance costs. I urge my colleagues to join with me by cosponsoring this vitally needed legislation.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the occasion of the 73d anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence—January 22, 1918. This event will be recognized by many of my constituents in Michigan on Sunday, January 20.

This year's celebration will be of particular significance since this is a time of great anxiety for Ukrainian people throughout the world. Their struggle for independence from the unyielding Soviet regime has escalated dramatically in the last year, and specifically in the last week. The ethnic Russians living in the Ukraine have threatened to disrupt any events connected to this celebration, and efforts to reestablish Ukrainian sovereignty. In view of these circumstances, it is crucial for us as Members of the United States Congress to express our support for the Ukrainian people. Their commitment to human rights and the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ideals of liberty and democracy are an inspiration to the world community.

My dear colleagues, please join me in recognizing this important anniversary celebration. Moreover, I ask you to give serious thought to the events currently unfolding in the Ukraine and the effect these may have on peace and stability in the post-cold-war world.

A WORLD RECORD ACHIEVEMENT—IN PEORIA

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we come across events whose significance transcends the specific facts of the matter. Such events are rare, but when they do occur, they are worth noting.

Such an event happened on November 23, 1990. On that date, the Peoria Rivermen professional hockey team of Peoria, IL, a triple A franchise of the National Hockey League St. Louis Blues, set a record no other team has ever achieved in the history of professional hockey—by winning 18 consecutive games in league competition.

This world record of 18 consecutive wins surpassed the previous record of 16 wins by the American Hockey League Baltimore Skipjacks during the 1984–85 season and 15 consecutive wins by the National Hockey League New York Islanders during the 1981–82 season.

This record was achieved by a team in the second year of private ownership after faltering under local government operation. Mr. Bruce Saur, a local businessman, purchased the Rivermen after the threat of disbandment due to lack of attendance, but Mr. Saur proved once again that the free enterprise system is alive and well in Peoria. In a larger sense, this achievement is the kind of thing that reminds us that Americans, in an increasingly competitive world, can't be satisfied by merely doing the usual. We have to have the attitude shown by the Rivermen, an attitude that breaks records, sets standards, and inspires us all. My congratulations go to the players, the coach, the owners, and all those connected with this fine accomplishment.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF ALAN FRIEDMAN

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the outstanding accomplishments of a dear friend, Mr. Alan Friedman, to my colleague's attention.

Alan Friedman served as the president of the Bet Tzedek, a free legal services provider to low income and senior citizens of Los Angeles County, from September 1989 to September 1990. In addition to his excellent service as Bet Tzedek president, Alan is a former

Bet Tzedek vice president and 7-year board member.

Bet Tzedek gained statewide recognition for its new Home Equity Fraud Prevention Task Force, which pursues legislative, legal, and community education approaches to stemming the tide of home equity fraud perpetrated on the elderly. The Los Angeles Times featured Bet Tzedek in an editorial regarding the work it has done in this area.

Furthermore, Bet Tzedek initiated its housing conditions action team designed to transform some of the worst housing conditions in Los Angeles through aggressive outreach, negotiation and litigation. Bet Tzedek continued to win over 90 percent of its contested cases.

In addition to being a superb lawyer and having a fabulous wife, Susan, and two great daughters, Joanna and Katie, Alan has also played a leading role in Los Angeles civic affairs. Among a host of significant positions, Alan served as president of the Los Angeles Board of Civil Service Commissioners, a president-elect of the Constitutional Rights Foundation, and labor relations counsel to the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee.

Alan has demonstrated a sincere and generous commitment to public service. We can all be proud of his impressive achievements and the extraordinary example Alan has set for the entire community.

FREEDOM FOR THE BALTICS

HON. TOM CAMPBELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, the action by the Soviet authorities in Lithuania parallels the action of their Stalinist forebears in 1956. When the world's attention was then focused on the Suez crisis, Soviet tanks rolled into Hungary to suppress the flame of freedom that had just sparked to life there. Now, as the world looks to the Middle East once again, cynical Soviet leaders use the occasion to suppress freedom in Lithuania. What makes this all the more appalling is that Gorbachev had promised freedom to Lithuania, if Lithuania would only follow the steps outlined in the union documents. It now appears that his statements may well have been a sham; a lie to buy time until the world's attention was directed elsewhere.

What must Americans do? We must not turn our heads. As crucial as the successful outcome of the crisis in the Persian Gulf may be, the cause of freedom is no less important in Vilnius than it is in Kuwait City. The only hopeful sign in the Soviet Union is that presidents of other constituent republics, notably Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation, have condemned the brutal use of force. We must strengthen the hand of those of similar views within the U.S.S.R.—and the best way to do this is to say that economic rapprochement with the West hangs in the balance. Gorbachev cannot succeed if his economy fails.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has just announced generous export credits granted to the Soviet Union so that they can purchase American food in their present economic con-

ditions. Those credits should be terminated at once. Today, I am introducing legislation to cut off this assistance. The people of the Soviet Union will soon know that their food lines are a little longer because of what their leaders have done in Lithuania. And we must continue to push in other ways as well for the full freedom of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

In the debate just concluded in this Congress concerning the Persian Gulf, frequent reference was made to the lessons of World War II. How cruelly apt these lessons are for the Baltics as well. Taken prisoner first by Stalin's Russia, then by Hitler's Germany, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia still have no freedom. Let us learn all the lessons of World War II. Let the call be as loud "Freedom for the Baltics!" as it has been "Freedom for Kuwait!"

VIOLENCE IN THE BALTIC STATES

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the world is focused on the Persian Gulf, we must not overlook the bloody military assault on the freedom-loving people of Lithuania and Soviet suppression in the Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia.

We must make it clear that the people of the United States deplore the attack Sunday that killed 14 peaceful protesters in Lithuania and injured 230 others. The United States and the rest of the free world must stand united in opposition to this powerful Soviet offensive against democracy.

President Bush is correct in condemning the violence in Lithuania and warning the Soviets that our relations with them could be affected. The upcoming summit with the Soviets, our trade relationship, and United States economic assistance should be reconsidered in light of the crackdown in the Baltic States.

We all rejoiced at the advance toward democracy during the past couple of years in Eastern Europe and the movement toward a more open society in the Soviet Union. It is most alarming and distressing that the independence movement is being squelched with tanks and military might. Bloodshed and suppression are not to be tolerated, and the Soviet leadership must be held accountable.

At a time when the United States is fighting aggression in the Persian Gulf, we must also stand firmly behind the rights of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to affirm their independence. I speak today to express my outrage and that of the people of northeastern Pennsylvania to the violence in the Baltic States.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CLEVELAND HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL MERIT SEMIFINALISTS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to salute students from Cleveland Heights High School which is located in my congressional district. Twelve students from Cleveland Heights High were recently named National Merit semifinalists, after receiving high marks on the Scholastic Aptitude Test. This represents the highest number of semifinalists for any public school in Ohio.

I join the community in saluting these students and recognizing this outstanding achievement. I would also take this opportunity to commend Cleveland Heights principal, Charles M. Shaddow, and his faculty for their commitment to academic excellence. The selection of 12 merit semifinalists from the school certainly exemplifies that commitment. I wish Principal Shaddow, his faculty and students much continued success.

NATIONAL MERIT SEMIFINALISTS

Andrea Bresky
Romin Dickey
Rachel Fogel
Xantha Karp
Sharon Kutnick
David Maris
Lydia Neilsen
Michael Pelsmajer
Beth Phillips
Josh Rakow
Mark Richardson
Steven Trost

NATIONAL MERIT COMMENDED STUDENTS

Dudley Battle
Ian Blevans
Eric Frew
Joseph Iorillo
Roman Lasek
Susan McGowan
Pamela Morales
Julie Roth
Caitlin Sedwick
Sara Seidel
Robert Weinmann
Elizabeth Winston
Dallas Wood

NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR OUTSTANDING NEGRO STUDENTS

Lori Lake
Anika Simpson

NATIONAL HISPANIC SCHOLAR AWARDS PROGRAM

Michael Pelsmajer

STOP THE VIOLENCE IN LITHUANIA

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express deep concern over the recent use of military force in Lithuania. The use of force to suppress freedom of speech in any cir-

cumstance is cause for concern, but in this case my concern is too great for me to remain silent. I just returned from spending an entire week in Moscow with four of my colleagues. By coincidence, Soviet tanks and paratroopers just happened to converge on Vilnius during my stay. My colleagues and I did not receive any word on Soviet troop movements from either Soviet or American officials. Not one word.

According to the Soviet military, the troops were sent to enforce the military draft laws. By its actions this past weekend, the Soviet military demonstrated the true reason and purpose for its presence. President Gorbachev has denied ordering the attack as has Defense Minister Yazov. While this may be true, neither man can escape ultimate responsibility for what occurred in Vilnius and what is likely to occur in Tallinn and Riga. President Gorbachev must understand that the dramatic events in Eastern Europe in 1989 are still fresh in the minds of his countrymen.

Further military suppression of such efforts will only stoke the fire of independence and cost the Soviet Government any and all support from the civilized Free world. Over the past several years President Gorbachev has driven the Soviet Union down the road to reform. He is now approaching a fork in the road, and he faces a difficult decision. Let us hope he continues down the road to reform. A road which would end 50 years of injustice to the Baltic people.

THE EMERGING TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1991

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 1991

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join Chairman JOHN DINGELL in introducing the Emerging Telecommunications Technology Act of 1991.

Today, advances in telecommunications technologies are creating new opportunities for American businesses and exciting new services for the American consumer. The radio frequency spectrum or airwaves, are the lifeblood of these critical technological advances. Industries which rely on the spectrum—such as television and radio broadcasting, pagers, cellular telephone, shortwave radio, garage door openers, and satellite transmissions—together generate more than \$100 billion in annual revenues.

Unfortunately, the commercial application of many of these technologies is threatened by the lack of available spectrum.

The FCC has reported that almost all of its usable spectrum, allocated for commercial activities, is currently assigned and heavily used. However, at the same time, a substantial portion of the spectrum allocated to the Federal Government, primarily the military, is underutilized.

This creative legislation should have become law last year. As many of you know, similar legislation was approved unanimously by the House last session but unfortunately

fell hostage to the administration's budgetary posturing on peripheral issues. Hopefully, such shortsightedness will not prevent the swift passage of this critical piece of legislation this year.

The bill we are introducing today would require the Secretary of Commerce to identify 200 MHz of radio frequency spectrum, currently assigned to the Federal Government users, for reallocation to our Nation's commercial sector and public safety activities.

The cellular industry provides a dramatic example of the economic benefits we can realize by releasing spectrum for commercial development. In 1968, the Government relinquished approximately 50 megahertz of the spectrum for cellular services. Today, the cellular industry is a \$4.5 billion industry serving more than three and one half million subscribers.

Without spectrum reallocation in 1968, the United States may not have become a world leader in the cellular industry. And without additional reallocation, we will be forced to choose between important new technologies such as HDTV and microcell communications, and among competing nonfederal interests, particularly from public safety users.

Even though the FCC, under Chairman Al Sikes is moving aggressively and taking positive steps to create the regulatory environment conducive to the maximum technological and economic progress possible, we need the additional radio spectrum that this legislation would reallocate to ensure that the United States fully invests in its technological future. While the FCC is bogged down in the lengthy administrative process attempting to best allocate the scarce spectrum between equally worthwhile applications, our competitors, particularly Japan and Great Britain, are actively making spectrum available for new technologies. The United States must establish forward looking policy initiatives to keep pace. Indeed, our future economic health may depend upon it.

A host of exciting new wireless technologies, such as "personal communications networks" where people could carry lightweight portable phones in the shirt pockets and place and receive calls in conceivably any location, eagerly await the breathing space in the radio spectrum this bill would provide and they need to flourish. We need to emphasize this pro-growth attitude to our domestic economic policy especially in light of the Nation's deteriorating economic situation. Moreover, if America truly wants to be a leader in the manufacturing and service of this next generation of telecommunications technologies, we need to make this important commitment to that endeavor at the present time in order to compete successfully in the global economy in the near future.

This legislation proposes a realistic and pragmatic means of effectively allocating spectrum to help ensure robust economic growth into the 21st century. It encourages the Government to employ more efficient spectrum management techniques and to free some of the unused and underutilized spectrum for reassignment to emerging commercial technologies. This legislation also provides that the President can substitute or reclaim any Government included frequency for any national defense emergency or other reason.

Our objective today is to meet the Government's current needs and weigh them carefully against industry's increasing needs and, develop a policy that both provides for America's national security needs and fuels economic growth into this decade and beyond.

THE FUTURE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

HON. EDWARD J. MARLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the future of telecommunications technology. The industry is growing rapidly and will continue to do so in the years ahead. It is important that we ensure that the industry has the spectrum it needs to continue to grow and to provide the services that we all expect and need.

The FCC has a critical role to play in ensuring that the industry has the spectrum it needs. It is important that we support the FCC's efforts to reallocate spectrum to the commercial sector and to public safety users. This will ensure that the industry has the spectrum it needs to continue to grow and to provide the services that we all expect and need.

THE FUTURE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

HON. EDWARD J. MARLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the future of telecommunications technology. The industry is growing rapidly and will continue to do so in the years ahead. It is important that we ensure that the industry has the spectrum it needs to continue to grow and to provide the services that we all expect and need.

The FCC has a critical role to play in ensuring that the industry has the spectrum it needs. It is important that we support the FCC's efforts to reallocate spectrum to the commercial sector and to public safety users. This will ensure that the industry has the spectrum it needs to continue to grow and to provide the services that we all expect and need.

THE FUTURE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

HON. EDWARD J. MARLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the future of telecommunications technology. The industry is growing rapidly and will continue to do so in the years ahead. It is important that we ensure that the industry has the spectrum it needs to continue to grow and to provide the services that we all expect and need.

The FCC has a critical role to play in ensuring that the industry has the spectrum it needs. It is important that we support the FCC's efforts to reallocate spectrum to the commercial sector and to public safety users. This will ensure that the industry has the spectrum it needs to continue to grow and to provide the services that we all expect and need.